A

TREATISE

OF

ANTICHRIST.

CONTEYNING

The defence of Cardinall Bellarmines Arguments, which inuincibly demonstrate, *That the Pope is not Antichrist.*

AGAINST

M. GEORGE DOWNAM

D. of Diuinity, who impugneth the same.

By Michael Christopherson Priest.

THE FIRST PART.

Si Patrem familias Beelzebub vocauerunt: quantò magis domesticos eius? *Matth.* 10.

If they haue called the Goodman of the house Beelzebub: how much more them of his household?

Imprinted with Licence, M.DC. XIII.

A

TREATISE

OF

ANTICHRIST.

TO THE KINGS MOST EXCELLENT MAIESTY.

MOST MIGHTY PRINCE,

I HOPE it will not be deemed any presumption, but rather a iust and necessary preuention, for me to offer this my *Treatise* concerning *Antichrist* to your Soueraigne Maiesty. Sure I am that it procedeth from a loyall and dutifull mynd desirous to auoid all occasion of offence, and ready to imploy my best labours, yea my life it selfe in your Maiestyes seruice. My aduersary likewise hath prouo-

ked me hereunto, what together with D. *Allen*, M. *Gabriel Powell* haue taken the same course with their disputations of the same subiect.

And though they may seeme to haue the better hand, by reason of your Maiestyes education, and present profession: yet I want not reasons of encouragement, wherby I may be induced to hope and expect your Maiesties fauourable patronage and protection. At least your Maiesty giueth all men good leaue, to dispute of this Controuersy, by accounting the Protestants proofs but bare coniectures: yea promising to yield to the Truth, when it shalbe manifested by more forcible Arguments, and more probable Interpretations; which we haue good cause of hope to see shortly performed, by the labours of so many learned men of forraine Nations, who haue vndertaken to giue your Maiesty satisfaction in this kynd. In the meane space, we cannot but highly extoll this rare modesty in so great a Monarch; especially when we heare M. *Powell*, and other such vnlearned Vpstarts protesting with full mouth, that they know as certainly, *that the Pope is the great Antichrist, as that God is in Heauen, and Iesus Christ*

Disput. de Antichr. in initio.

our

our Saviour, and Redeemer.

Certainely, it is ſtrange, how any man could fall into a fit of ſuch extreme, and impudent madnes, were it not that God permitteth ſometymes ſuch exceſſe of malicious folly, for the reclayming of others miſled and ſeduced by theſe erring guids and falſe Prophets. In which reſpect I haue alway thought this Queſtion very profitable, and of great importance, to omit how neceſſary the diſcuſſion thereof may proue ſooner then we are aware, in regard of the true, and great Antichriſt himſelfe; whoſe comming we haue far more reaſon to expect in our dayes, then the Ancient Fathers had in theirs.

Thus the diuine Goodneſſe alway turneth euill into good, and maketh all things concurre to the welfare of his Elect; and by this ſtrang paradox and calumniation, preuenteth and prepareth vs againſt Antichriſts comming, with an exact Diſcouery of his whole proceeding, and perſecution: which whoſoeuer conſidereth attentiuely, as it is layd downe in the ſacred Scripture, and declared by the holy Fathers, will eaſily perceaue that hitherto the chiefeſt ſignes, and notes of Antichriſt haue not byn fulfilled by any. So

that indeed there can be no doubt, or queſtion, whether he himſelfe be come; only ſome controuerſy might be moued, which of his forerunners doth moſt reſemble him.

And in this alſo the matter may eaſily be decided; for who ſeeth not, that the falſe *Mahomet* draweth nigheſt vnto him both in name and deedes? His name contayning the number 666. which is by *S: Iohn* aſſigned to Antichriſt, and his impiety, enmity, and perſecution againſt Chriſt, and Chriſtians is notorious to the whole world. For which cauſe there haue not wanted ſome, both Catholicks, and Proteſtants, who haue perſuaded themſelues, that there is no other Antichriſt to be expected. But theſe are euidently confuted by many inuincible arguments. Notwithſtanding this their errour, though neuer ſo groſſe, may ſeeme in ſome ſort excuſable becauſe they impugne a certayne, and manifeſt enemy.

Sue Peresius in Apoc.

But what ſhall we ſay of thoſe who take their marke ſo much amiſſe, that they make the chiefe viſible Paſtour of Chriſts Church a member of Sathan, yea Antichriſt himſelfe? Can any thing be more abſurd, or intollerable? Is it poſſible, that any Chriſtian would giue *Luther* the hearing, when his proud

ſpirit

ſpirit of contention, and contradiction made him firſt breake forth into this open blaſphemy? How did not Princes perceaue, that this was the high way to all rebellion? Could they conceaue or imagin, that Temporall Authority & Iuriſdiction would be regarded, where the chiefeſt ſpirituall power vpon earth was thus impudently contemned, and trodden vnder foot? Can they truſt to their Pedigrees, when they ſee the continuall ſucceſſion of 1500. yeares ſo lightly eſteemed? What better Title can they pretend for themſelues, then the expreſſe words of our Sauiour, with which he eſtabliſhed *S. Peter*, and his Succeſſors?

Your Maieſty wiſely obſerued, that vnleſſe the Authority of Bishops were mayntained, that of Princes could not ſtand: *No Bishop, no King*, ſaith your Maieſty. And certaine it is, that no lawfull Bishop can be vpholden againſt the Popes Authority, to which all other ſpirituall Iuriſdiction is ſubordinate. Can any Iudge or Magiſtrate of the Realme be independant of your Maieſty? This is ſo euident, that euen the Puritans themſelues, though otherwiſe neuer ſo blinded with malice againſt the Pope, could not chooſe but ſee it.

In the conference at Hampton-court.

it. For which cauſe they ſtick not to *proteſt to all the world, that if the Prelats haue the Truth* (reſpecially in this point) *the Pope and the Church of Rome* (*and in them God, and Chriſt Ieſus himſelfe*) *haue great wrong and indignity offered vnto them, in that they are reiected, and that all the Proteſtant Churches are Schiſmaticall in forſaking vnity, and communion with them.*

In the Chriſtian and modeſt offer &c. published anno 1606. pag. 16.

Thus then it plainely appeareth that the *Proteſtants*, neither according to the Truth it ſelfe, nor in the *Puritans* iudgment, can defend themſelues, & their pretended Biſhops, but by eſtabliſhing the Pope, and *Romain* Church. And all the vehemency which they vſe againſt the Pope to proue him Antichriſt, falleth vpon themſelues, who participate with him in admitting the Hierarchy of Biſhops. And as for other proofes proper to *Puritans*, they are inforced to anſwere them as well as we; yea moſt of all theſe Arguments be ſuch, as might very eaſily be turned againſt any lawfull Prince whatſoeuer, and much more againſt ſuch Proteſtant Princes, as beſides their Temporall power make clayme to ſpirituall Iuriſdiction. Let any diſcreet Reader reflect vpon all particulers, and he will eaſily diſcerne, that if Catholicks had by no more mode-

moderate then *Luther* and other Proteſtants were, King *Henry* could not haue intitled himſelfe *Head of the Church in ſpirituall, and Eccleſiaſticall affayres*, without hauing the name of Antichriſt applyed, and appropriated vnto him. For if ſuch contumelious inferences be made againſt the Pope in great part, becauſe he is ſuppoſed (though falſly) to arrogate more to himſelfe in Temporall affayres, then of right he ought; how much more would the ſame imputation fall vpon ſuch a Prince, as did firſt vſurp ſpirituall Iuriſdiction, without eyther example or other probable pretenſe?

But I will not vrge theſe odious inferences any further: your Maieſty will eaſily conceaue how far this proiect might be purſued. And by peruſing this ſmall labour of myne, which I now offer to your Maieſty, it will manifeſtly appeare, that we haue euident, and inuincible Arguments taken out of Scripture and all Antiquity, to free our chiefeſt Paſtour, the Popes Holynes, from this moſt abſurd and falſe calumniation: and that whatſoeuer any Proteſtant can anſwere to theſe our proofes, is without any difficulty ouerthrowne, and confuted. As likewiſe their rayling inuectiues, and friuolous obiections are

presently dissolued, & returned vpon themselues. All which considered, I account it no presumption to be an humble Suppliant to your most Excellent Maiesty for some release and mitigation in the pressures, and persecutions which Catholicks endure, vnder this pretence of the Popes being Antichrist.

For how can it possibly stand with iustice or reason, that a lawfull Prince should punish his loyall subiects for performing their duty to their spirituall and lawfull Pastour? That Rebells should vphold Hereticks, who are Traytors against God and his Church, it were no meruaile, since they all agree in the impugnation of superiour powers. And yet it is too notorious to the world, what Catholicks suffer for their conscience in your Maiestyes Dominions? what losse of lyuings, & liberty, yea sometyme of life it selfe? How busy are Pursеuants in ransacking their houses, abusing their seruants, and apprehending their persons? What insolencyes and vexations are they constrayned to endure? And to omit the generality, and seuerity of this persecution, from which neither frailty of sex, nor band of matrimony, nor Nobility of birth can exempt any; how many things lye hid and

vn-

vnknowne, which would astonish and amaze the world if they were laid open to the view therof? What prying and inquiring into mens secret actions; in somuch that euen ordinary prouision for the sustenance of nature, cannot be made without suspition of Treason, as appeared not long since by the pot of peares, which were supposed to haue bene balls of wildfyre. How many are beaten, and tormented euen to death in priuate houses, without any publick tryall? Some Prentises in the Citty of *London* can giue good testimony heerof.

I might adde such other particulers, as the rods kept in store by some of no small account, for yong youths vnder twenty yeares, whom they vse like schollers, thinking it not to be against their grauity to whip them priuately with their owne hands. But I will not offend your Maiestyes eares with the recitall of such base, and vnworthy actions. Only I will humbly beseech our Blessed Sauiour to moue your Maiestyes hart to take pitty and compassion of these abuses, by giuing present Order for the redresse, and reformation of so much, as your Maiestie already misliketh, which we hope to be the greatest part.

And for the rest, we only craue this fa-

nour, that we may be ſpared, vntill vve be heard: for vve nothing doubt, but that if your Maieſty vvould once reſolue to informe your ſelfe thoroughly of the truth, God vvould not be vvanting to our iuſt deſires, and to your Maieſties ſo Honourable and neceſſary endeauours.

GOD of his goodnes direct and protect your Maieſty. AMEN.

Your Maieſties moſt faithfull Subiect, and humble Oratour.

Michael Chriſtopherſon P.

THE

THE PREFACE

to the Reader.

TO ſome I doubt not, this my labour, which I haue taken in diſcuſsing this queſtion of Antichriſt, will ſeeme ſuperfluous, or at leaſt not ſo well beſtowed, as it might haue bene in many other ſubiects. And they will be much confirmed in this their opinion, if they conſider, that among ſo many learned men, as haue written in our language, and euidently confuted the hereſies of our tymes; none of them haue vouchſafed to yield ſo far to our Aduerſaries, as to handle this queſtion of ſet purpoſe, which doubtles they omitted not without great conſideration and weighty reaſons: the chiefeſt of which, if I be not deceaued, was for that they perswaded themſelues, that few or none, eſpeciallie of the prudent and moderate ſort, did indeed, and in their hart hold this abſurd paradox, though they were content to let it paſſe, becauſe it ſerued for a motiue to withdraw the common people from the Catholike faith, which in their conceipt conteyned other errors.

And for this cauſe thoſe worthy and zealous writers endeauored chiefly to take away this falſe perſwaſion of the Churches erring, partly by confirming and demonſtrating the infallibility of her authority, and partly by deſcending to particuler controuerſies, and moſt euidently conuincyng the Churches doctrine in euery one of them to be conformable to the diuine Scriptures and all antiquity. For they did eaſily diſcouer, that by this courſe they ſhould not only confute this abhominable blaſphemy; but alſo with one and the ſame labour confirme and eſtabliſh the contrary truth: viz. that the Catholike Church, togeather with her ſupreme Paſtour, is the piller of Truth and the building of Chriſt, againſt which no force of errors or hereſies either hath or euer ſhall be able to preuayle.

Which courſe of theirs as moſt prudent in it ſelfe, ſo likewiſe moſt profitable to others, I am far from myſliking, but doe altogeather approue and admyre it. And yet notwithſtanding, I hope, that this my labour may be in ſome ſort profitable alſo. For all are not ſo quick wytted, as to make theſe neceſſary inferences, but rather many are with-held from yielding to the manifeſt truth in other pointes by a preiudicate opinion, which they haue conceaued in this; and the iuſt and diſcreet ſilence, which hath hitherto bene vſed, miniſtreth to them ſome cauſe of ſuſpition, that the Proteſtants haue reaſon for that they ſay; eſpecially ſince they vrge this point ſo much both in their Writings and Sermons, and the matter is of ſo great importance and conſequence, that whoſoeuer hath the truth on his ſyde in this, ought iuſtly to be beleiued in the reſt, ſince that Antichriſt can neither agree with Chriſt, nor ſo great a calumniation as this is of the Pope (if it be falſe) can agree or ſtand with the ſpirit of truth. Beſides, the Proteſtants out of this their doctrine make moſt odious inferences againſt Catholikes, as to go no further, we may ſee in M. Downams *laſt Chapter, where he deduceth out of it ſix concluſions.*

Firſt,

First, that out of this all other controuerſies may be decided; *and that the doctrine of the Catholike Church is to be reiected, as* the errors of Antichriſt. *Secondly*, that their ſeparation from vs, is warranted, yea commaunded by the word of God, and all returning forbidden. *Thirdly*, that all they which partake with vs, are reprobates, and to be damned. *Fourthly*, that the Recuſant Papiſts, but eſpecialy Ieſuites and Seminary Prieſts ought not to be fauoured or ſpared in a Chriſtian Common wealth. *Fifthly*, that there can be no reconciliation betwixt Proteſtants and the Church of Rome *Sixtly*, that Proteſtants ought to be thankefull to God, who hath not ſuffered them to be carried away with this Catholike Apoſtaſy. *By which laſt wordes we may alſo note, that if this their poſition of the Pope being Antichriſt doth fall, they haue no colour left to accuſe the Catholike Church of ſchiſme or hereſy, and conſequently it remayneth euident, that ſhe is the true Church of Chriſt. For no ſchiſme or hereſy can be Catholike or vniuerſall, as the* Roman *Church is; only the perſecution and Apoſtaſy of Antichriſt may in ſome ſort vſurpe this name; becauſe, though it ſhall want the vniuerſality of tyme, being to remayne but a very ſhort tyme, yet it ſhalbe very vniuerſall in reſpect of place, as is manifeſt by that, which is ſaid in this Treatiſe.*

Thus much ſhall ſuffice of the importance and neceſsity of this my ſmall labour. And now I will briefely ſay ſome thing of Cardinall Bellarmine, *whome I defend, and of* M. Downam *whome I confute. And concerning this renowned and moſt learned Cardinall, I ſhall not need to vſe many wordes, his fame being ſpred ouer the whole world by his large, and profound diſputations againſt all ſortes of heretiks which haue riſen or are extant in theſe our dayes. Wherefore it ſhalbe ſufficient to note, that which maketh to our purpoſe, that in this his Treatiſe of Antichriſt he vſeth not ſo many arguments as ſome others*

haue

haue don; only contenting himselfe with those which are proper and peculiar to this place; omitting others, which do rather proue, that the Pope is the chiefe Pastour of Christes Church then disproone that he is not Antichrist, which in him proceedeth from two causes: the one is, his exactnes in the method, and diuision of his disputations, which conteyne euery one seuerall questions and arguments: the other, for that hauing before sufficiently discussed the affirmatiue position that the Pope is, and ought to be acknowledged to be the chiefe Pastour of Gods Church, he would not make any needeles repetition of those demonstrations, but rather proceed to other which hitherto he had not touched, and which directly concluded, that the Pope, not only by reason of his office, but also in respect of his person can in no sort be that Antichrist, which the Scriptures and Fathers affirme, that we are to expect towards the end of the world. I shall not need to adde any more in commendation of this his worke for that the whole Treatise following hath no other subiect, & I haue translated his whole Booke verbatim, *so that the Reader may peruse it, and iudge of it himselfe. It were superfluous to giue any reason, why in my allegations of this worthy Cardinall, I only mention his name for the most part: for any man may easily perceaue, that I do it for breuities sake, and according to the vse of Schooles, and not for any want of respect to his place and person, whome I honour from my hart, and defend him in this Treatise, so far, as my poore ability will giue me leaue.*

Concerning M. Downam *(for so I commonly call him, to giue him to vnderstand, that I impugne not his person, but his detestable heresy) I shall haue something more to say: for first the Reader must not be ignorant that he hath peruerted the order of this disputation. For, whereas* Cardinall Bellarmine *first demonstrateth, that the Pope is not Antichrist, and afterward answereth the obiections of his Aduersaryes,* M. Downam

Downam *tooke it to be his beſt courſe, firſt to obiect whatſoeuer either former hereticks had inuented, or he himſelfe could adde, omitting altogeather the anſwers, which* Bellarmine *gaue; that by this meanes, he might poſſeſſe his Readers mynd by inueighing againſt the Pope at his pleaſure, without any contradiction: and ſo haue him the more fauourable when he came to make ſhew of anſwering to* Bellarmins *arguments.*

This is the cauſe, why I am conſtrayned to confute M. Downams *ſecond booke in the firſt place; not producing the argumẽts without his ſolutions, as he dealt with the Cardinall, but examining whatſoeuer he anſwereth diſtinctly; in ſo much, that, one Chapter excepted where his confuſion would not permit it, in all the reſt, euery number of my confutation anſwereth to the ſame in him: ſo that if any man hath a deſire to confer, what both he and I ſay, he may eaſily do it, by reading firſt one ſection or number in him, & then the ſame in me; which I would require of all ſuch as do any way doubt of my ſincere dealing, becauſe he findeth not* M. Downams *wordes* verbatim *alleaged; which could not be without great prolixity. But he that goeth thus far, ſhould alſo do well to read ſo much in Cardinall* Bellarmine, *as is diſcuſſed in euery ſeuerall number, which, that the Reader may conueniently doe, I haue alſo prefixed numbers to the Cardinalls diſcourſe, and noted in the margent, where that, which is handled in euery ſeuerall place, may be found in him without difficulty.* Cap. 4.

And by this meanes I hope the Reader may peruſe this my labour with clarity, and profit, and diſcouer M. Downams *falſe dealing, aſwell in this point ſpecified, as in many other, which now it is no tyme to rehearſe, they beeing very neere as many as there be leaues in this whole Booke, and they may eaſily be found, by either peruſing the marginall notes, or ſeeking in the table at the word* Downam. *And yet perhaps it will not be amyſſe to note one or two of them in this place, which eſpe-*

* * *

cially

cially discouer the badnesse of M. Downams cause. For what can be more absurd or hatefull to Christian eares, then to heare the enemyes of Christ, and his Church, commended and imbraced, and his true Seruants and Doctors insolently reiected and accused of errours? And yet this is M. Downams case, not once or twyce, but throughout the whole course of this disputation: for he doth not only agree in substance with the Samosatens, who are knowne heretikes, and condemned by his owne iudgement, but also ioyneth himselfe ex professo with that vile Apostata and capitall enemy of Christ Porphiry, not only against S. Hierome, who most earnestly and learnedly confuteth him at large, but also against all other Ecclesiasticall writers, yea euen the very Iewes themselues, who in that point agree with the Christians; but in another, where they are opposite to vs, there M. Downam ioyneth with them: so that it seemeth, that M. Downam and his fellow Protestants seeke of purpose, how they may oppose themselues to Christ and his Church, yea that they esteeme more of Gentilles and Iewes, then they do of Christian writers, though neuer so many, so worthy, or so ancient.

And surely whosoeuer shall consider attentiuely, how often, and how scornefully the ancient Fathers and pillars of Christs Church, be reiected by M. Downam, cannot choose but admire, yea hould vp his handes and blesse himselfe, to thinke, how it hath byn, and is still possible, that either they themselues, or others by them should be so bewitched. Neither can there any probable cause be giuen of so great blindnes, and so enormous a cryme, but only the want of Gods grace, which their sinnes haue with-drawne, and deserued, that they shauld be in this sort as it were giuen ouer to a reprobate sense. What can be said in defence of this detestable excesse? Deny it they cannot, the thing being so euident, and so often reiterated. And dare they excuse it, by telling vs, That the Fathers are only forsaken, when they forsake the Scripture? Is not this

plainely

plainely to make Infidells and Heretikes better Interpreters of Scripture then the Church of Christ, and all Christians in generall, and the moſt learned Paſtours thereof in particuler? If they anſwer, that it is not the authority of theſe Infidells, which they follow, but the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, which they experience in themſelues; is this any thing els in effect, then to acknowledge that Porphiry, *and the* Iewes *had the true ſpirit of Chriſt, and that the ancient Fathers, and the Church of Chriſt in their tyme had it not? For if the Proteſtants, haue the ſpirit of Chriſt now, it is manifeſt, that thoſe others had it then, ſince their expoſitions be all one. But who is ſo fooliſh and ſacrilegious, as to depriue Gods Church and Saintes of his ſpirit, and attribute it to his profeſſed enemyes, and conſequently how ſhall we belieue the Proteſtants, when they tell vs that they are full of Gods Spirit, ſince we ſee their ſpirit to agree with that of the Diuells inſtruments, and to be quite oppoſite to that of Gods elect? Heere is no ſtarting hole to be found, neither haue they any thing to reply, but only to ſtand vpon their bare affirmation; which* M. Downam *doth ſo often in his diſputation, ſtill deſiring to haue that graunted which is chiefly in queſtion. But I will omit this, and the reſt of his abſurdities, remitting the Reader to his owne experience, after that he hath with diligence peruſed the whole.*

Heere I would make an end of this Preface, hauing ſaid aſmuch, as I thinke neceſſary concerning the diſputation, which followeth. But becauſe I haue lately ſeene two Sermons not long ſince preached by this our Doctour, by which it ſeemeth, that he hath reſolued to relinquiſh Puritanime and turne Proteſtant, I thought it good to admoniſh my Reader of this point alſo; becauſe I rather inclined before to thinke, that he was a Puritan, and inſinuated ſo much in a place or two. And withall by this occaſion, I muſt intreat my Reader to marke the great difference betwixt M. Downam *in theſe his Sermons,* Chap. 10. & 13.

and the ſame man in his booke of Antichriſt: for in this he euery where reiecteth all antiquity, as I haue ſaid, but in his Sermons he ſingeth vs a new ſong, and can tell vs: that it neuer yet happened that the neweſt thinges did proue the trueſt, *and argueth chiefely from authority, obiecting ſtill to his Puritan Aduerſaries,* That they go againſt the whole ſtreame of all Antiquity, *yea he can alleadge* S. Auguſtine lib. 4. de Bapt. con. Donat. cap. 24. & ep. 118. *to proue that the conſent of the whole Church argueth either the definition of a Councell, or an Apoſtolicall Tradition, though he corruptely tranſlateth (* Traditum, Ordayned *) and likewiſe in the ſecond place, where* S. Aug. *affirmeth that,* Inſolentiſſimæ inſaniæ eſt, *it is a moſt inſolent madnes to diſpute againſt that which (* vniuerſa Eccleſia *) the whole Church obſerueth; he addeth of his owne the word (* Primitiue *) that ſo he may haue ſome ſtarting hole againſt vs, when he is vrged with the ſame Authority of S.* Auguſtine, *which if he would follow himſelfe, as he would now haue the Puritans do, he muſt of force retyre himſelfe from the Proteſtants alſo, and betake himſelfe to the Catholike Church, which all Antiquity moſt manifeſtly defendeth.*

And ſurely whoſoeuer conſidereth the arguments, which Proteſtants *make againſt* Puritans, *cannot but euidently perceaue, that the very ſame principles do ouerthrow the* Proteſtants *themſelues. And I meruaile much, how they can defend themſelues from that terrible ſentence of* S. Paul, Inexcuſabilis es o homo omnis, qui iudicas: quo enim iudicas alterum, teipſum condemnas, eadem enim agis, quæ iudicas. *And the very ſame iudgment falleth vpon the* Puritans *themſelues, when they go about to impugne the* Browniſts, Familiſts, Anabaptiſts, Arians, *or any other ſect whatſoeuer. For this they cannot do, but by Antiquity, which notwithſtanding they are forced to reiect in all thoſe pointes, in which*

which they differ, and dissent from the Catholike Romen Church.

I will not descend to any particulers, though I easily might; for what can be more euident, then that the authority of S. Cyprian *& other Fathers, who vrge the necessity of a Bishop, for the conseruation of vnity, is much more to be vnderstood of one chiefe Bishop in the whole Church, then of particuler Bishops in particuler Dioceses, since there can be no question, that vnity is as necessary in the whole world, as in one Dioceese, and much more easily maintained in this, then in that? Likewise* M. Downam *can tell vs not only of Bishops, but also of* Metropolitans *and* Patriarches, *and alleadgeth for his purpose the Councell of* Nice; *but he will not acknowledge that in the same Councell,* Rome *hath the first place, and is preferred before all others, as likewise* Alexandria, *and* Antiochia *are before* Ierusalem (*which* M. Downam *would willingly haue the chiefe*) *of which there can be no other true reason giuen, but the excellency of* S. Peter *aboue the other Apostles, who founded three Churches, and placed or fixed his Seat in* Rome, *where he ended his life with a most happy Martyrdome. Now if we aske* M. Downam *a reason why he seeth not this, as well as that which fauoureth the Protestants against the Puritans, I cannot imagine, what he can answere vs, but only that by this meanes he should incurre the disgrace, and ouerthrow of his Ministry, which he esteemeth so highly. But I intreat both him, and all other, euen as they tender their owne saluation, to looke about them in tyme, and not to suffer themselues to be carried away with the sway of the tyme, and the desire of worldly pleasures and preferments, which* M. Downam, *and all others may easily conceaue not to be very great, if his complayntes of pouerty, and contempt, which he maketh in his former Sermon be true, as no doubt they are in great part, and these miseryes will daylie increase, as their credit doth decrease,*

ſo that if now that pittifull (yet ridiculous) complaint of M. Downam *be true*, That not only euery meane man almoſt preferreth himſelfe before the Miniſter, but alſo diſdayneth to beſtow either his Sonne on the Miniſtry, or his Daughter on a Miniſter, *the tyme no doubt will come, and that ſhortly alſo, that they ſhalbe inforced to marry only within their owne Tribe; for I can aſſure him, that neither the Kings, nor the Nobility of* England *will imitate thoſe of* Iuda *in this; and it will be their only way to get a Law enacted, that their generation may ſucceed them in their Miniſtry; which* M. Downam *ſeemeth to wiſh, and to miſlike that law not a little, which (in a parentheſis) he telleth vs hath otherwiſe prouided.*

Ser. 1. pag. 67.

Theſe are the baſe and carnall cogitations of theſe new Ghoſpellers; and yet all will not ſerue: for they ſhall neuer find a remedy for this their griefe except they returne to the Catholike Church, whom they may thanke for the liuing they haue. But in it God hath prouided for this, & all other inconueniences, that can any way ariſe: and in particuler for the deciding of all queſtions and controuerſies. Wherefore if the Proteſtants and Puritans will haue an end of this of their Biſhops and Presbitery, they muſt of neceſsity ſtand to the Catholike Churches iudgment, in which they ſhall find Biſhops eſtabliſhed, and yet ſometimes, by reaſon of perſecution, Prieſtes only without Biſhops, as now we ſee in our Country, where conformable to that which in their iudgmēt was practiſed in the Primitiue Church in many places, at leaſt for a tyme, we haue hitherto only Prieſtes ſubordinate to an Arch-Prieſt; but yet we are far from miſliking Biſhops, but do both wiſh, and expect them, when our lawfull Superiour, who ſucceedeth the chiefeſt of the Apoſtles, ſhall ſee it conuenient.

M. C.

A TA-

A TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS of this first Part of *Antichrist*.

THE disputation of Antichrist is propounded, and the first Argument from the name it selfe discussed. CHAP. I.

That Antichrist shalbe a certaine determinate man. CHAP. II.

That Antichrist is not yet come. CHAP. III.

The first demonstration, That Antichrist is not yet come. CHAP. IIII.

The second demonstration. CHAP. V.

The third demonstration CHAP. VI.

The fourth demonstration. CHAP. VII.

The fifth demonstration. CHAP. VIII.

The sixt demonstration. CHAP. IX.

Of Antichristes Name. CHAP. X.

Of Antichristes Character. CHAP. XI.

Of

Of Antichriſtes Generation. CHAP. XII.
Of Antichriſtes Seate. CHAP. XIII.
Of Antichriſtes doctrine. CHAP. XIIII.
Of Antichriſtes myracles. CHAP. XV.
Of Antichriſtes Kingdome & warres. CHAP. XVI.
Of Gog and Magog. CHAP. XVII.
The dotages of Heretikes are confuted, with which they do not ſo much proue, as impudently affirme, that the *Pope is Antichriſt*. CHAP. XVIII.
The trifles of the *Smalcaldicall* Synod of the *Lutheranes* are confuted. CHAP. XIX.
Caluins lyes are refuted. CHAP. XX.
The lyes of *Illyricus* are refuted. CHAP. XXI.
The fooleryes of *Tylemanus* are refuted. CHAP. XXII.
The lyes of *Chytræus* are refuted. CHAP. XXIII.
The arguments of *Caluin* and *Illyricus* are confuted, who go about to proue, that the Pope is no longer a Biſhop: where alſo the fable of Pope *Ioane* the Woman is confuted. CHAP. XXIIII.

CARD-

CARDINALL BELLARMINES THIRD BOOKE of the Pope.

THE FIRST CHAPTER.

Wherin the disputation of Antichrist is propounded.

WE haue demonstrated hitherto (*saith Bellarmine*) that the Pope succeedeth S. Peter in the chiefest Princedome of the whole Church. It remayneth that wee see, whether at any tyme the Pope hath fallen from this degree, for that our aduersaries contend, that hee is not at this time a true Bishop of *Rome*, whatsoeuer hee was before. And *Nilus* in the end of his booke against the Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, speaketh thus: *But let that be the summe and head of my speach, that while the Pope keepeth in the Church a conuenient, heauenly, and of ancient tyme appointed order, while hee holdeth and defendeth the heauenlie truth, & while he cleaueth to Christ, the chiefe and true Lord and head of the Church, I will easilie suffer him to be both the head of the Church, & the chiefest Priest, & the successor of Peter, or els if he will, of all the Apostles, that all obey him, and that whatsoeuer belongeth to his honour, be in nothing diminished: but if he be departed* I.

» *from the truth, & will not returne to it, he ought deseruedly to be accoun-*
» *ted of, as one that is condemned and reiected.*

II. » But he should haue shewed, into what errours the
» Bishops of *Rome* are fallen, and when, and by whome they
» were condemned. For we know, that in the Generall *Late-*
» *ran* Councell vnder *Innocentius* the third, and of *Lyons* vnder
» *Gregory* the tenth, and of *Florence* vnder *Eugenius* the fourth,
» the *Greekes* being conuicted of errour, returned to the Faith
» of the *Latins*, and afterward alway returned to their vomit
» againe, and were therefore most grieuously punished by
» God; but we neuer read that the *Latins* came to the Faith of
» the *Greekes*. Neither can there any Ecclesiasticall iudgmēt
» be produced against the *Latins*, as wee bring many against
» the *Greekes*.

III. » Now *Caluin Lib. 4. cap. 7. §. 23. Let* (saith he) *all*
» *those things be true, which notwithstanding wee haue now wrested from*
» *them, that* Peter *was by the voice of Christ, appointed* Head *of the*
» *vniuersall Church, & that he left the honour giuen vnto him in the Roman*
» *Sea, that thus was established by the authoritie of the auncient Church, &*
» *confirmed by long vse, that the chiefest authoritie was alway due from all to*
» *the Bishop of* Rome, *and that he was the iudge of all causes and men,*
» *that he was subiect to the iudgement of none; let them haue more also if*
» *they will: Yet I answere in one word, that nothing of this standeth in force,*
» *except the Church and Bishop be at Rome.* And after §. 24. *Let the*
» *Romanists vntie me this knott: I deny that their Pope is the Prince of Bi-*
» *shops, since that he is not a Bishop.* And after. *Let* Rome *in tymes past*
» *haue bin the Mother of all Churches: but since she began to become the seate*
» *of Antichrist, she left to be that which she was.* And after §. 25. *Wee*
» *seeme to some, backbyters and slanderers, when wee call the Bishop of*
» Rome *Antichrist, but they which thinke soe, vnderstand not that they*
» *accuse* Paul *of immodesty, after whome we speake, yea out of whose*
» *mouth we speake soe. And least any obiect, that we wrongfullie wrest*
» Paules *wordes against the Pope which perteine to another purpose, I will*
» *briefliе shew, that they cannot be vnderstood otherwise, then of the Pope-*
» *dome.* So he.

IV. » The like teach al the heretikes of this tyme, & chiefliе
» *Luther in supput. temporum, & in assert. art. 28. & 36.* and often in
» other places. Likewise the *Magdeburgenses Centur. 1. lib. 2.*
» *cap. 4. colum. 434. & sequent.* and in all the following Cen-
turies

turies *cap.* 4. 7. 10. *Illyricus in lib. de primat. Dauid Chytraus in cap.* 9. *&* 13. *Apoc.* Likewise *VVolfgangus Musculus in loc. commun. tit. de Ecclesia. Theodor. Beza in Com.* 2. *Thessal.* 2. *Theodor. Bibliander in Chron. tabul.* 10. 11. 12. *&* 14. *Henricus Pantaleon in Chron. Henricus Bullinger præfat. in suas homil. ad Apocal.* And before all these *Iohn VVickliffe art.* 30. amongst those which are condemned in *Concil. Constantiensi sess.* 8. pronounced the Pope to be Antichrist.

VVherfore that this question may be diligentlie explicated, nine heads are to be treated of. First of the name it selfe of Antichrist. 2. VVhether Antichrist be one man or a kind of men. 3. Of the tyme of his comming and death. 4. Of his proper name. 5. Of what nation he shalbe borne, & by whome he shall chiefly be receaued. 6. Where he shall fixe his seate. 7. Of his doctrine and manners. 8. Of his miracles. 9. Of his kingdome and warres. For out of all these, it will most cleerely appeare, with what impudencie the heretikes make the Pope Antichrist: to which we will adde a Chapter, wherin we will proue, that the Pope is not onlie not Antichrist, but that hee hath in no sort left to be the Bishop and pastour of the whole Church, that nothing may remayne not solued of *Caluins* obiections. V.

For the first, some of our aduersaries teach, that the name of Antichrist doth properlie signifie the Vicar of Christ, and therefore that the Pope, who affirmeth himselfe to be Christs Vicar is Antichrist. So teacheth *VVolfgãgus Musculus in locis cap. de potest. Ministrorũ*, and he proueth it, because that word ἀντὶ signifieth *vice*, whence ἀντίχριστος is *vice-Christi*, in Christs place, as ἀντιστρατηγὸς signifieth him who obtrudeth himselfe for Captaine, that is, who will be accompted the Captaynes Vicar. The *Magdeburgenses cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. *colum.* 435. do teach, that the Pope is therefore the true Antichrist because he maketh himselfe the vicar of Christ. VI.

But without doubt they are deceaued, or endeauour to deceaue, for the name of Antichrist cannot in any sort, signifie the Vicar of Christ, but only some that is contrary to Christ: and contrarie not howsoeuer, but in such sort, that he striueth with him for the seate & dignity of Christ, that is, who is *æmulus Christi*, at emulation with Christ, and VII.

» would be accounted Christ, hauing cast him downe who
» is truly Christ.

VIII. » That this is the signification of this name, it is proued
» three waies. First because among the *Grecians* the word
» ἀντὶ doth properlie signifie *opposition*, and because not onlie
» those things are said to be opposed, which are repugnant
» one to the other, but also those, which are of equall value,
» from thence it proceedeth, that ἀντὶ in composition, some-
» tyme signifieth *contrarietie*, sometyme *equiualence*, as is mani-
» fest in the examples of all such names, ἀντίπαλος signifieth an
» *emulous* in a combate, ἀντίδοτον a cõtrary remedie, ἀντίφρασις
» a cõtrarie speach, ἀντίστροφος equiualent, ἀντίθεος equall
» to God, ἀντίχειρ is the thumme, because it is opposed against,
» and is equiualent to all the rest of the hand, and so of the rest.
» But a Vicar doth not signifie opposition, but subordination
» to another, and therefore it cannot be expressed by the
» word ἀντὶ.

IX. » Now that ἀντιστράτηγος doth not signifie the Captaines
» Vicar, but ordinarily a contrarie Captaine, as ἀντιστρατεύομαι
» is to make warre, and sometime him that is in the Captai-
» nes place, not as subiect to him, but as equall, as among
» the *Latins*, *Proprætor* or *Proconsul* doth not signifie the Vicar of
» the Pretor or Consul, but him that is in some Prouince,
» that which the Pretor or Consul is in the Citty: and in
» this *Musculus* was deceaued; for because he read in *Budæus*
» that ἀντιστράτηγος doth signifie a *Propretor*, he thought that it
» doth signifie the Vicar of the Pretor, which is false.

X. » Secondly the same is proued out of the Scripture: for al-
» though this name were of it selfe ambiguous, yet as it is take
» in Scripture it is not doubtfull: and our question must not
» be of the word ἀντίχειστος absolutelie, but as it is taken in
» the Scriptures. Now in the Scriptures, Antichrist is said to
» be him who is extolled aboue all that is called God, 2.
» *Thess.* 2. which certainelie is not to be the Vicar, but the
» enemy of Christ. And 1. *Ioan.* 2. Antichrist is sayd to be him,
» who denieth *Iesus to be Christ, that he may sell himselfe for Christ*:
» and *Matth.* 24. Antichrist is said to affirme himselfe to be
» Christ, which certainily is not the part of a Vicar, but of an
» Emulous.

Third-

Thirdly out of all the Authors, who haue written of Antichriſt, and out of the common ſenſe of all Chriſtians, who by Antichriſt vnderſtād a certaine notable falſe Chriſt. In which ſort expoūdeth alſo this word of the ancient Greeks S. *Damaſcen lib.* 4. *de fide cap.* 28. and after the ſame manner doth S. *Hierome* expound it of the *Latins*, who notwithſtanding was alſo moſt skilfull in the *Greeke* tongue, *quæſt.* 11. *ad Algaſiam*. XI.

Laſtlie ſo alſo expoundeth it in his *Theſaurus linguæ Græcæ* *Henricus Stephanus*, who notwithſtanding is one of the heretikes of *Geneua*. Hence we haue our firſt argument againſt our aduerſaries. For ſince the name of Antichriſt ſignifieth the enemy and emulous of Chriſt, and the Pope confeſſeth himſelf to be Chriſts ſeruant, and ſubiect to Chriſt in all thinges, and in no ſort ſaith, that he is Chriſt, nor maketh himſelf equall to him, it is manifeſt, that he is not Antichriſt. XII.

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. FIRST *M. Downam* telleth vs of two great aduātages that *Bellarmine* hath againſt him and all Proteſtants in this point. 1. In reſpect of his *great learning & much reading*. 2. In that he is to *proue the negatiue part*, ſo that it is inough for him, if he *can but shew plainelie and euidently, that any one ſeueral & eſſential mark aſcribed vnto Antichriſt in the Scriptures, doth not agree to the Pope*. All which wee willinglie acknowledg, and from hence doe inferre *M. Downams* ignorance and impudency, that whereas it had bene inough for *Bellarmine* to haue diſproued him in one point, it is not inough for him that he is diſproued in all, as the Reader will eaſilie perceaue in peruſing the particuler arguments. Likewiſe we acknowledg the controuerſie to be of that importance and conſequence, that it manifeſtlie conuinceth them to be the limmes of Antichriſt who are in errour cōcerning this point: for this conſequēce doth not onlie touch vs, if we were in the wrong, as *M. Downam* ſeemeth to inſinuate by only naming vs, but it cōcerneth them alſo as fullie, ſince that it is euident that none Bellarmins aduantages in this cōtrouerſy. The importance of this cōtrouerſy.

but heretikes can charge any, and much lesse the chiefe Pastour of Christs Church, with so foule an imputation. Now how true it is, that all heretikes are lymmes of Antichrist, I need not shew, since that it is graunted on both sides. And therfore it behooueth M. *Downam* and his fellows to haue as great a will to cleere themselues in this behalfe, as it doth vs; and so much the more also, because we are but the defendants, and they are the slanderous calumniators; & likewise, for that some of their owne brethren do much condemne their insolencie and rash bouldnes in this assertion.

2. Now wheras he affirmeth, *that the conceipts of the elder Papists who lined in the dayes of our forefathers, concerning Antichrist, were meere dotages*, he only sayth it, and therby discouereth his spitefull spirit, which prouoketh him to rayle without reason, and to slander against all truth. For the Catholikes of former dayes, held the very same, that we do now, though they explicated not themselues so fully, as *Bellarmine* and others do now. In which respect only these may in some sort be truly called *the refiners of Popery*, that is, the explicators and confirmers of Catholike doctrine against heretikes. But the reason of this difference betwixt the elder and later writers is euident, for in their dayes Heretikes were not so impudēt as to vrge so palpable and grosse errors, as they are in our time: for otherwise *Bellarmine* sufficiently declareth the antiquity of his doctrine, by prouing whatsoeuer he sayth by the authority of the ancient Fathers. Now whether *many haue contributed to Bellarmins bookes*, or no, it is little to the purpose, though the truth is, as those know that are best acquainted with his studies, that they are all his owne labours. And that this may not seeme strange, *M. Downam* may easily informe himselfe, that diuers other of his order, that liued in the same time, and some in the same place, haue in diuers kindes written as large volumes, as *Bellarmine* hath in this. Wherof *Salmeron*, *Tolet*, *Valentia*, *Molina*, *Suarez*, *Vasquez* and others may serue for example. Well to come to the matter, *M. Downam* seemeth to allow of *Bellarmines* method and diuision, since that he obiecteth nothing against it, but commeth presently to his first argument.

Bellarmin agreeth with the elder Catholikes.

V.

3. In which to make a good beginning, he corrupteth

Bellar-

Bellarmines argument, by altering both words and sense: for thus he setteth it down: *Antichrist is* hostis & æmulus Christi, *that is, such an enemy, as is opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour. The Pope is not an enemy, nor opposed vnto Christ in emulatiõ of like honour, therfore the Pope is not Antichrist.* Wheras *Bellarmine* endeauoureth to prooue nothing els in this Chapter, but that the name of Antichrist signifieth *not the Vicar of Christ, but only some that is contrary to Christ, and contrary not howsoeuer, but in such sort, that he striueth with him for the seate and dignity of Christ, so that he would be accompted Christ, hauing cast him downe who is truly Christ:* which is not to be opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, but of the same and equall honour, which are far different matters. For who seeth not, that many things are like, which are not the same? or rather speaking in rigour, that nothing is like, that is the same? And so likewise of equalitie, there be manie things like, which are not equall. As for example, the vnitie of Christs seruants among themselues, is like to the vnion of Christ with his Father, but not the same, nor equall vnto it. And in this our question, who doubteth that the Vicar of Christ, as of any other, is like vnto him in honour, but yet he hath not in any sort the same or equall honour to that which Christ hath; as not to explicate other differences, it is euident, that whosoeuer is Vicar to another, acknowledgeth dependancie of another, which the principall doth not. Now then the whole controuersy being about this sense of the word ἀντίχειστος, whether it may signify not only an enemy or emulous of Christ, but also his Vicar or Vicegerent, no meruaile though *Bellarmin* wholy insisteth vpon the proofe thereof: and in this he sheweth not himselfe to be a sophister, but *M. Downam* proueth himselfe to be a calumniatour and a falsifier, as is manifest. But yet in some sort he seemeth to acknowledg and amend this fault by affirming that ἀντὶ *in composition, commonlie signifieth three things, opposition, equalitie, substitution*, by which as afterward he explicates himselfe, he vnderstandeth subordination, which indeed is that which *Bellarmine* denieth, and *M. Downam* proueth onlie by repeating the example of *Musculus*, & adding two others to it which he interpreteth after that manner, and saith in general, that *Greeke writers and Lexicographers*

Downam corrupteth Bellarmines argumẽt.

Ioan. 17.

phers doe teach soe, as ἀνθύπατος proconsul, ἀντιστράτηγος proprator, or legatus pratoris, or, qui est vice pratoris, ἀντίστασις the putting of one case for another. And in this sense (saith he) the sacraments of the new Testament substituted and ordayned insteed of the old, are called the ἀντίτυπα of them. But it is meruaile he saw not that, which Bellarmine had writtē against Musculus, who aleadged ἀντιστράτηγος, as M. Downam doth, and Bellarmine answered to them both, that it signifieth not the Vicegerent of a Captaine, but ordinarilie a contrarie captaine, as ἀντιστρατήγημα is to make warre against, and sometymes him that is in the Captaines place, not as subiect to him, but as equall, as among the Latins Proprator, or Proconsul doth not signifie the Vicegerent of the Pretor or Consul, but him who is in some Prouince, that which the Pretor or the Consul is in the Citty. And in this was Musculus deceyued, for reading in Budæus that ἀντιστράτηγος signifieth Proprator, he thought that it did signifie the Vicegerent of the Pretor, which is false. Thus far Bellarmine. By which M. Downam might haue vnderstood the cause of Musculus his error, whose authoritie, as it should seeme by that he citeth no other, he only followeth: and in the other examples, which he bringeth, there is the same reason, because one case is equiualent with the other, and the Sacraments of the new law are not onlie equall, but also of greater value, and withall opposite to those of the old law, with which they could not stand or be in vse, at the same tyme.

Downam repeateth his fellowes argument, omitting Bellarmines answere.

X.

How Antichrist is taken in the Scripture.

4. To Bellarmins second proofe out of Scripture M. Downam granteth the Conclusion, though he would faine wrāgle about 2. Thess. 2. and Matth. 24. for that Antichrist is not named there, though he and all other graunt, that they are to be vnderstood of Antichrist, and consequentlie he shalbe such as is there described. Likewise he would cauill about the place in S. Iohns Epistle, in which he saith the name of Antichrist *is ascribed to such as being enemies, notwithstanding professed the name of Christ, as the heretikes of those tymes*. Where he seemeth to haue forgotten, what he and Bellarmine haue agreed vpon, that the name of Antichrist is taken either properlie or commonly, as also the name of Christ, and consequently as the members of Antichrist doe oppose themselues to the members of Christ, contending which of them are to haue that appellation; so Antichrist properlie taken, shall striue with

1. Iohn 2.

Bellar. cap. 2. Dow. lib. 1. cap. 1. 3.

with Chriſt whether of them is to be accounted trulie and properly Chriſt. And when *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of ſuch enemies as profeſſe the name of the true Chriſt, he meaneth only of Antichriſts forerunners and members, which are only the members of Antichriſt, and not properly Antichriſt himſelf, who notwithſtanding at the firſt, till he hath gotten credit & authority, will perhaps deale deceitfully, but afterwards will plainely oppoſe himſelf to Chriſt, as *S. Matth. S. Paul* & *S. Iohn* alſo doe teach in the place, which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth, in which *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of an open & profeſſed enemy as is manifeſt. And *M. Downam* ſhould haue anſwered to that place directly, and not haue run to others, and ſo bouldly affirmed, that *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh only of hidden enemies, againſt the expreſſe place which he was to anſwere. To the third proofe, he only anſwereth, that if *all Authours meane that Antichriſt, ſhalbe ſuch a falſe Chriſt, as ſhall plainely and directly affirme himſelfe to be Chriſt the only Meſſias, then their affirmation agreeth not with that Antichriſt, whome the Scriptures deſcribe*; which is in effect to admit, that all thoſe authors are againſt him, but that he vnderſtandeth the Scripture better then they all: only he vouchſafeth to anſwere in particuler to his good friend *Henricus Stephanus*, ſaying, *that neither he, nor any approued author denieth, but that Antichriſt may ſignify him, who being an enemy of Chriſt, profeſſeth himſelf to be his Vicar*. Now you muſt ſuppoſe, that no Authors are approued whome *M. Downam* miſſlikes: and beſides conſider how any Author can take occaſiō to deny that which they neuer heard brought in queſtion, and withall we are to note that (*may*) of *M. Downams*, which only importeth that the name of Antichriſt *may* be applied to his mēbers; but now our queſtion is, what is the proper ſignification of that word, as it is vnderſtood of the chiefe Antichriſt himſelfe, and not of his members.

XI. Downam reiecteth all authors

XII.

5. To the aſſumption, he anſwereth, graunting it in all, that the Pope confeſſeth of himſelfe in word, but in deedes he ſaith, that the Pope *in many things matcheth himſelf with Chriſt, and in ſome thinges aduanceth himſelfe aboue him*: which he ſaith, that he hath proued els where, which we are to examine in that place. Now it is ſufficient for vs, that the Pope is noe open enemy of Chriſt, as Antichriſt ſhalbe. For of this

See cap. 14.

it followeth evidently, that the Pope is not the chiefe Antichrist, properly so called, which is all that *Bellarmine* intendeth to proue in this place.

THE SECOND CHAPTER.

That Antichrist shalbe a certaine determinate Man.

I. "NOw concerning the second (saith *Bellarmine*) we agree with our Aduersaries in one thing, & differ in another. We agree in that, that as the name of Christ is take in two sorts, somtime properly for one excellent & singular Christ, who is *Iesus Nazarenus*, somtime commonly, for all those who haue likenesse with Christ in being annointed, in which sort all Prophets, Kings, & Priests are called Christs, *Psal.* 104. *Touch not my Christs*: So also the name of Antichrist somtime is taken properly for one notable enemy of Christ, of whome there is mention 2. *Thess.* 2. *Ioan.* 5. and in other places, and somtime commonly for all who in any sort impugne Christ. For 1. *Ioan.* 2. we read, *You haue heard that Antichrist commeth, and now many are become Antichrists.* That is, yow haue heard that Antichrist shall come, and now though that singular Antichrist be not yet come, yet many seducers are already come, who also may be called Antichristes.

II. But we disagree of Antichrist properly so called, whether he be one singular man. For all Catholikes thinke so, that Antichrist shalbe one certaine man: but all the heretikes before alleadged teach, that Antichrist properly so called, is not any singular person, but a singular Throne, or Tyranical King-

Kingdome, and Apoſtolicall ſeate of them who gouerne the Church. The *Magdeburgenſes cent.* 1. *lib.*2.*c.*4.*col.*435. *The Apoſtles teach* (ſay they) *that Antichriſt ſhall not be only one perſon, but an whole kingdome, by falſe Doctors ruling in the temple of God, that is, in the Church of God, in the great Citty, that is, in the Roman Citty, gotten by the worke, fraude, and deceipt of the Diuell.* So they. The like are in others before alleadged. Their reaſons are theſe.

III. First, *S. Paul* 2. *Theſ.* 2. ſaith, that already, euen in his time Antichriſt had begun to be in the world, *the myſtery of iniquity doth worke now*. And notwithſtanding he ſayth in the ſame place, that Antichriſt ſhalbe ſlaine by Chriſt in the end of the world. From hence *Beza* concludeth thus vpon 2. *Theſſ.*2. *They are manifeſtly deceaued, whoſoeuer thought, that this was to be vnderſtood of one Man, vnleſſe they giue me ſome one, who may remaine aliue from* Paules *tyme vntill the day of Iudgement*. See alſo doth *Caluin* argue in the place which I cyted before. This reaſon is confirmed out of *S. Iohn*, who in the firſt Epiſtle and fourth Chapter ſaith: *Euery ſpirit that diſſolueth Ieſus, is not of God, and this is Antichriſt, of whome you haue heard that he commeth, and now he is in the world.*

IV. *Beza's* ſecond reaſon is, becauſe *Daniel* in his 7. Chapter by the particuler names of the beaſtes, a Beare, a Lion, and a Leopard, doth not vnderſtand particuler Kings, but ſeuerall Kingdomes, one of which conteyneth many Kings: therfore after the ſame manner *Paul.* 2. *Theſſ.* 2. who doth wonderfullie agree with *Daniel*, by the man of ſinne, and ſonne of perdition, doth not vnderſtand one particuler perſon, but as it were a certayne body of many Tyrants.

V. The 3. reaſon is *Caluins* vpon the 2. Chap. of firſt Epiſtle of *S. Iohn*, where he ſaith, *that they doe dote, and willfullie erre, who beleiue that Antichriſt ſhall be one man, ſeeing that Paul* 2. *Theſſ.* 2. *hath written, that the Apoſtaſy ſhall come, and that Antichriſt ſhalbe the head of it. For Apoſtaſy is a certaine generall failing, or defection frō the Faith, which indeed maketh one body, and one Kingdome, & is not a matter of a few yeares, that it can be accomplished vnder one King.*

VI. For all this the truth is, that Antichriſt ſhalbe one particuler man, which is proued out of all the Scriptures & Fathers, who treat of Antichriſt. The places of Scripture be fiue: the firſt is in the Ghoſpell of *S. Iohn cap.* 5. *I came in the*

"*name of my Father, and you receaued me not: if another come in his*
"*owne name, him will you receaue. Musculus & Caluin in Marlor. in*
"*Comment. huius loci*, will haue these words to be vnderstood
"of false Prophets in generall, and not of any one: but their
"exposition is repugnant to the ancient Fathers, and with
"the text it selfe. For that these wordes are spoken of Anti-
"christ, do witnes *S. Chrysostome*, and *S. Cyrill* vpon this place,
"*S. Ambrose* vpon the 2. *Chap.* of the 2. *Epist.* to the *Thessalonias*,
"*S. Hierome* in his Epistle to *Algasia*, the 11. question, *S. Augu-*
"*stine in* 29. *Tract.* vpon *S. Iohn*, *S. Ireneus* in the 5. *book* against
"the heresies of *Valentinus*, *Theodoretus* in the Epitome of the *di-*
"*uine Decrees in the chap. of Antichrist*.

VII. "Besides in this place, our Lord doth oppose to himself
"another man, that is person to person, not Kingdome to King-
"dom, nor sect to sect, as it appeareth in those words, I, *Another*,
"*In the name of my Father*, *In his owne name*, *Me*, *Him*. Wherfore as
"Christ was one particuler man, soe shall Antichrist be one
"particuler man.

VIII. "Moreouer Christ saith in this place, that Antichrist
"shall be receaued for *Messias* by the Iewes, and it is certayne
"that the Iewes expect one certayne and particuler man. In
"like maner all false Prophets came in the name of another,
"and not in their owne name, *Ierem.* 14. *The Prophets do falsely*
"*prophetize in my name, I sent them not &c.* But heere our Lord
"speaketh of one certaine man, which shall come in his owne
"name, that is, who shall acknowledg no God at all, *but shall*
"*extoll himselfe, as S. Paul* saith, *aboue all that is called God*. Finally
"very many false Prophets were come before Christ, verie
"many also were to come afterward, therfore our Lord
"would not haue said, *if another shall come*, but, *many do come*, if
"he would haue spoken of false Prophets.

IX. "The second place is 2. *Thess.* 2. *Vnles there come a reuolt*
"*first, and the man of sinne be reuealed, the sonne of perdition &c.* And
"after: *And then the wicked ore shalbe rauealed, whom our Lord Iesus*
"*shal kil with the spirit of his mouth*. These words the Aduersaries
"themselues vnderstād of the true Antichrist, but the Apostle
"speaketh of a certaine determinate & particuler person, as ap-
"peareth by the Greeke articles ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρ-
"τίας ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, and after καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος.

For

For as S. Epiphanius hæreſ. 9. which is of the Samaritans; teacheth, the Greeke articles doe contract the ſignification to one certaine thing, ſoe that ἄνθρωπος ſignifieth *man* in common, but ὁ ἄνθρωπος a particuler man. And ſurely it is marueile, that none of the Aduerſaries, who notwithſtanding do boaſt of skil in tongues, haue obſerued this.

The third place is where we read thus, 1. Ioan 2. ἠκούσατε ὅτι ὁ ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, where he putteth the article before Antichriſt, ſo properly called, & he pronounceth the name of Antichriſt, commonly taken, without the article; moſt plainly ſhewing that Antichriſt properly taken is one certaine perſon, but Antichriſt cōmonly ſo called is no certaine perſon, but in general all heretikes. X.

The fourth is Dan. 7. 11. & 12. Chapters, where he ſpeaketh of Antichriſt, as S. Hierome & Theodoretus vpon that place, Irenæus lib. 5. Auguſt. lib. 20. de Ciuitate Dei cap. 23. yea Caluin, the Magdeburgenſes, & Beza vbi ſupra do teach. And there Antichriſt is not called one Kingdome, but one King, who often Kings which he ſhall find in the world, ſhall take three quite away & ſhal ſubiect vnto himſelfe the other ſeauen Beſides, Caluin ſaith, that litterallie Daniel ſpeaketh of Antiochus Illuſtris, & allegoricallie of Antichriſt, whom Antiochus figured, which S. Cyprian teacheth in his booke of Exhortation to Martyrdome cap. 11. & S. Hierome vpon the 11. & 12. of Daniel. But Antiochus was a certaine & particuler perſon. Therfore Antichriſt muſt be alſo one certaine perſon. XI.

The fifth and laſt place is Apoc. 13. & 17. where S. Ireneus lib. 5. affirmeth, that Antichriſt is ſpoken of, and it is plaine by reaſon of the likeneſſe of Daniels & S. Iohns words: for both of them make mention of ten Kings which ſhalbe in the world when Antichriſt ſhall come, and both of them foretell, that Antichriſtes Kingdome ſhall endure three yeares and a halfe &c. As therfore Daniel ſpeaketh of one determinate King, ſo alſo doth S. Iohn in the Apocalyps. XII.

The ſame is proued out of the Fathers, who with cōmon conſent doe teach of Antichriſt: Firſt, that he ſhalbe a moſt choſen inſtrument of the Diuell, ſo that in him ſhall inhabite all fulneſſe of the Diuels malice corporally, as in Chriſt being a man doth inhabite all plenitude of Diuinitie XIII.

« corporallie. Secondly that Antichrist shall not raigne more « then three yeares and a halfe, and consequently they teach, « that Antichrist shalbe only one man. See *S. Irenæus lib.* 5. to- « wardes the end, *Cyril of Ierusalem, Catechesi* 15. *S. Chrysostome in* « 2. *Thess.* 2. *Theodoret in cap.* 7. *Dan. Lactant. in epit. diuin. Inst. cap.* « 11. *S. Ambrose in cap.* 21. *Luc. S. Hierome in cap.* 7. *Dan. & q.* 11. « *ad Algasiam. S. Augustine lib.* 20. *de Ciuitate Dei*, in many Chap- « ters, and vpon the 9. *Psalme. S. Gregory lib.* 32. *Moral. cap.* 12. « *S. Damascen lib.* 4. *cap.* 28. & *S. Hyppolitus Martyr* in his Oration « *of the Consumation*, or end of the world.

XIV. « To the first argument of *Beza* I answere, that in the « Apostles tyme Antichrist did begin secretly to giue onsetts, « not in his owne person, but in his forerunners. For as « Christ began to come from the beginning of the world, in « the Patriarches and Prophets, who went before him, and « did signifie him, soe that the mysterie of piety may be said « to haue begun to worke from the beginning of the world, « and notwithstanding he came not in his owne person, vn- « till he tooke flesh of the B. Virgin: So Antichrist straight « after the Ascension of Christ into Heauen began to come in « his forerunners, & the mysterie of iniquitie began to work, « to wit in the heretikes and Tyrants which did persecute the « Church, and chieflie in *Symon Magus*, who called himselfe « Christ, and in *Nero*, who first began to impugne the Church; « and yet notwithstanding in his owne person he shall not « come, but in the end of the world. Wherefore the spirituall « persecution of *Symon Magus*, and the temporall of *Nero*, is « called the mystery of iniquity, becaule they were signes & « figures of Antichrists persecution.

XV. « That this is the true explication of the place of *S. Paul*, « may be proued in two sortes. First by all the interpreters of « that place: for all doe, by the mystery of iniquity which *S.* « *Paul* mentioneth, vnderstand either *Nero's* persecution, as *S.* « *Ambrose*, and *S. Chrysostome* vpon this place, and *S. Hierom quæst.* « 11. *ad Algasiam*, or the Heretikes, who do deceaue secretly, « as *Theodoretus* and *Sedulius* vpon this place, & *S. Augustine lib.* 20. « *de ciuitate Dei cap.* 19.

XVI. « Secondly by a reason taken from the aduersaries con- « fession. For they say, that Antichrist properly is the seate

of

of the Biſhop of Rome. If therfore Antichriſt ſo properly called was borne in the Apoſtles tyme, it doth follow that *S. Peter* & *S. Paul* were properlie called Antichriſts, although ſecret, and that *Nero* or *Symon Magus* were the true Chriſt. For it is well knowne, that in the Apoſtles time, there were no other Biſhops of *Rome*, but *S. Peter* & *S. Paul*. For *Ireneus lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. doth plainly affirme, that the Sea of *Rome* was founded by *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, and that they were the firſt Biſhops there, which all the auncient Fathers, which I cited before, doe alſo teſtifie. It is alſo well knowne that both *Symon Magus* and *Nero* did cõtend with *S. Peter* & *S. Paul*. Wherfore if the Aduerſaries miſlike, that *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* were Antichriſts, and *Symon* & *Nero* the true Chriſt, they are forced to confeſſe, that in the Apoſtles tyme Antichriſt was not come in himſelfe, but only in a certayne Type of his: by which meanes *Beza's* conſequence with which he concluded, that Antichriſt cannot be one man, vnles we could giue him one man who ſhould liue from the Apoſtles tyme to the end of the world, is ſhewed to be ridiculous.

To confirme this I ſay, that S. *Iohn* doth ſpeake in that manner, as our Lord ſpeaketh of *Elias*, *Matth.* 17. Elias *indeed ſhall come, and reſtore all things, and I ſay vnto you, that* Elias *is already come, and they did not know him:* that is, *Elias* in his owne perſon ſhall come, but *Elias* in his like is come already, to wit, in *S. Iohn Baptiſt.* XVII.

To the ſecond Argument. Firſt it is denied, that alway *Daniel* by particuler beaſts, doth vnderſtand ſeuerall Kingdomes: for by one beaſt he doth ſometymes ſignify one Kingdome, as in the 7. *Chap.* where by the Lion he vnderſtandeth the Kingdome of the *Aſſyrians*, by the Beare the Kingdome of the *Perſians*, by the Leopard the Kingdome of the *Grecians*, by the other beaſt vnnamed the Kingdome of the *Romans*. Sometymes one King, as in the 8. *Chap.* where by the Ram he doth vnderſtand *Darius* the laſt King of the *Perſians*, by the Goate *Alexander* the Great. XVIII.

Secondly I deny the conſequence of his argument: for *S. Paul* by the man of ſinne, doth not vnderſtand any of the foure beaſts deſcribed by *Daniel*, but he vnderſtandeth that little horne, which as *Daniel* writeth preuailed againſt the ten XIX.

» ten hornes of the fourth beast, that is, that one King, who
» from a little beginning did so increase, that he subdued all
» the other Kings vnto him.

XX. » To the last Argument I answere many wayes, that
» it may be vnderstood how impudently *Caluin* wrote, that
» they do wilfully erre, who do not gather out of that argu-
» ment of his, that the Bishop of *Rome* is Antichrist.

XXI. » First by the Apostasy in *S. Paul*, most rightly Antichrist
» himselfe may be vnderstood, for so with common consent
» do the Greeke Interpreters teach, *S. Chrysostome*, *Theodoretus*,
» *Theophilactus*, and *Oecumenius*, and besides *S. Augustine lib.* 20. *de*
» *ciuit. Dei cap.* 19. and Antichrist is called the Apostasy, both
» by the figure called *Metonymia*, because he shalbe the cause,
» that many forsake God: and also by a certaine excellency,
» for he shalbe such a notable Apostata, that he may be called
» the Apostasy it selfe.

XXII. » Secondly by the Apostasy, may be taken the defection,
» or falling from the Roman Empire, as many of the *Latins* do
» expound, as *S. Ambrose*, *Sedulius*, and *Primasius*. For as in the
» Chapter following we will demonstrate that Antichrist
» shal not come, before the Roman Empire doth wholy perish.

XXIII. » Thirdly if we admit, that by the Apostasy is meant the
» defectiō or failing from the true Faith & religion of Christ
» (as Caluin doth shew) we are not driuen into any straits or
» difficulties. For it is not necessary, that *S. Paul* speaketh of
» the Apostasie of many ages, for he might speake of some very
» great and singular apostasy, which shall only be in that very
» short time, in which Antichrist shall raigne, and so *S. Augu-*
» *stine* in the place before cited, that is *l.* 20. *de ciuit. Dei. cap.* 19.
» writeth, that this place was vnderstood of many Ancients,
» who probablie did teach, that Antichrist appearing, all
» Hereikes or faygned Christiās should wholy come to him,
» & by that meanes there would be at that tyme a very great
» Apostasy, such as neuer had bene before.

XXIV. » Fourthly, if we graunt to *Caluin*, that *S. Paul* speaketh
» of another Apostasy of many ages, yet he shall get nothing.
» For we may say that, that Apostasy doth not necessarily be-
» long vnto one body & Kingdome of Antichrist, nor require
» one head, but that it is a disposition to Antichrists King-
doms

dome, & that it is made in diuers places, vnder diuers Kings, and vpon diuers occaſions, as now we ſee that *Africa* is failed, or reuolted to *Mahomet*, a great part of *Aſia* to *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, and other Prouinces to other Sects.

Fiftly and laſtly, if we ſhould graunt to *Caluin*, that the generall Apoſtaſy from the fayth, and which endureth now many yeares, is Antichriſts Kingdome, it would not ſtraightway follow, that the Pope is Antichriſt: for that queſtion were to be handled, who hath failed or reuolted from the Faith or Religion of Chriſt, we or they; that is, the *Catholikes* or the *Lutherans*? Though they ſay, that we are thoſe, which haue failed, notwithſtanding they haue not yet proued it, nor hath it bene declared by any common Iudge. And truly we can farre more eaſily prooue, that the *Lutherans* are thoſe, who haue failed, then they prooue, that the *Catholikes* haue failed. For that they haue failed from the Church, in which they were before, they themſelues do not deny. For to let paſſe the reſt, *Eraſmus Sarcerius* vpon that of the 2. *Theſſal.* 2. *Then the wicked one ſhall be reuealed*, doth plainely confeſſe, that almoſt all the predeceſſors of the *Lutherans*, and he alſo did ſometimes obey the Biſhop of Rome, therfore they haue fayled from the Church, and Religion of their predeceſſors. But that we haue failed from any Church, neither haue they demonſtrated hitherto, neither will they euer be able to demonſtrate. Wherfore when they read in *S. Paul*, *Vnles the reuolt or Apoſtaſy be come, and the wicked one reuealed &c.* and thinke that they are departed from the Church, in which they were, and that we do perſeuer alway in the ſame ordinaces, it is meruaile, if at leaſt they do not feare, leaſt *S. Paul* ſpake of them.

XXV.

Out of this ſecond head, we haue the ſecond argument, to prooue that the Pope is not Antichriſt. For if Antichriſt be only one perſon, and there haue bene and ſhall be many Popes, endued with the ſame dignity and power; certainely Antichriſt is to be ſought els where, then in the Roman Sea.

XXVI.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

VI. 1. MAISTER *Downam* denieth, that Antichrist shall be one particuler person, and to *Bellarmins* first place of Scripture he answereth, *that in that place of* S. Iohn, *Christ* Ioan. 5. *speaketh indefinitely of any false teacher, which should come to the Iewes in his owne name, that is not sent of God.* Secondly he speaketh also *conditionally*, If another come. Thirdly *he speaketh of those Iewes, to whom he speaketh, and not of those Iewes, which shalbe in the end of the world.* In which exposition of his, and especially in the first and third point, he is contrary to *Bellarmine*. Let vs see therfore, how he answereth to *Bellarmines* reasons. First to the Fathers he saith, that none of them hath that word *vno*, as though it were not sufficient, that they haue others equiualent, and yet *S. Augustine lib. 2. contra Aduersar. legis cap. 12.* expresly distinguisheth the chiefe Antichrist frō others, in that he is *vnus maior ceteris*, and they *multi*. And *S. Hierom* in *Dan. 7.* calleth him, *vnum de hominibus*. Secondly he sayth, that the *Fathers vnderstand that place also of* S. Matth. 24. v. 24. Matth. 24. *where our Sauiour speaketh in the plurall nūber of Antichrist*: as though the chiefe & proper Antichrist may not be one man, because there will be others like vnto him, though farre inferiour in malice. Wherfore when our Sauiour speaketh generally of all false Prophets, no doubt, he excludeth not the chiefest of them, but includeth him in the first place, so that whatsoeuer is common to all, doth most fitlie agree to him: and therfore it is noe meruaile though the Fathers take it, as spoken principally of him. But on the other side when our Sauiour maketh mention only of one, he is not to be vnderstood of all. And this is the difference betweene the Fathers exposition, and *M. Downams*, that they obserue the first and he the second, and therefore it is no meruaile though they do not agree. Neither is it against the Fathers, *that the Iewes haue receaued more then one*; but it is against *M. Downam*, that they haue not receaued all that came: besides, that it is hard to shew, that so many of the Iewes receaued any one false Prophet, as those were that receaued the true Christ; whereas our Sauiour plainly affirmeth, that they shall generally receaue

ceaue him, of who he speaketh. Wherfore thirdly, he telleth the Fathers roundly, *that they had no reason to restraine those words vnto Antichrist alone*, & against them all opposeth *Nonius* a Poet, *in his paraphrase, who expoundeth* it thus: Εἰ τις ἄλλος ἐστιν &c. *but if any other come*: As though this Poets authority were equall to all the Fathers, or (τὶς) might not signify *aliquis*, or *quidã*, as well as *vllus*, or *quis*, *some*, or *a certayne*, as well as *any*, especially in a Poet, who is sometime constrained to straine the sense, to make vp his verse. Lastly he addeth, *if these answeres of his will not suffice*, thẽ yet he will not yield, except he see first proued, *that whatsoeuer those Fathers wrote concerning Antichrist, is true*. But I hope he will be better aduised, and thinke it sufficient, that whatsoeuer our Sauiour saith of Antichrist is true, and that in vnderstanding his meaning, we must rather beleiue such learned men as haue the authority of the Fathers on their side, thẽ those that trust only to their owne wits, hauing neither more learning nor iudgment, then the other. For I perswade my selfe, that *M. Downam* wil not preferre himselfe before *Bellarmine* in either. Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

2. To the first confirmation he answereth, that when alius *is taken definitely, as Io.* 18. 16. *&* 20. 2. 3. 4. *then it is true; but where it is vsed indefinitely, as Iob* 31. 8. 1. *Cor.* 3. 10. *and in this place, then it is not*. And by his citing of the Greeke word in the first sense, with an article, and in the second without, it should seeme, he would haue that to be the signe, in whether sense it is to be taken. But all this discourse proceedeth from want of vnderstanding *Bellarmines* confirmation; for he goeth not about to proue, that our Saniour speaketh of the cheife and proper Antichrist, but this supposed, gathereth that he shall be one particuler man, for that he opposeth him as one person, to himselfe, who was one particuler person also. To which *M. Downam* answereth not, but onlie denieth the suppositiõ, as though *Bellarmine* had gone about to proue that with this confirmation: neither doth that rule of the greeke article hould alway, especially in *M. Downams* sense and opinion, as we shall see a little after. VII. Downam mistaketh Bellarmine.

To the second confirmation, he denieth, *that Christ foretelleth, that Antichrist shalbe receaued of the Iewes for their* Messias. *First because his speach is conditionall, and onlie sheweth them, what in respect* VIII.

of their present disposition, they were ready to doe. As though this were not inough for *Bellarmines* confirmation: for it is certayne they would not haue receaued him as their *Messias*, if he were not a particuler man, which is all that *Bellarmine* intendeth to proue. Now, besides in the Scripture, the word (If) sometime signifieth (*when*) which the Fathers iudge also to be in this place. Secondly M. *Downam* saith, that the word *alius*, is *indefinite*. But that is only his owne interpretation against the Fathers. Thirdly he saith, *that our Saviour did not say, that they would receaue him for their* Messias, but so he is to be vnderstood. For that they were to receaue him, as they were bound, and refused to receaue our Sauiour, for of this he speaketh. Fourthly he saith, *that the Iewes, to whome, & of whome our Sauiour speaketh, shall not be alive at the comming of the great Antichrist, according to the opinion of the Papists themselues.* But M. *Downam* should haue remembred, that not a whole leafe before, he himselfe said, that *Bellarmine*, and the rest of the Papists vnderstand Christ to speake of those Iewes, which shalbe in the end of the world. To the third Confirmation, first M. *Downam* saith, that it would proue *Antichrist to be no false Prophet*: which is true, if he speake of the inferiour sort of false Prophets. After he giueth another exposition that *he shall come vnsent of God*, or as *Lyra* sayth, *that he shall not haue testimonies from God, as Christ had*: neither of which are contrary to *Bellarmines* exposition, but rather both included in it. But besides the negatiue, he shall also haue the affirmatiue, as both our Sauiour & S. *Paul* saith, against whome M. *Downams* argument concludeth not, which is thus: *The Iewes expect their* Messias *from God*, and consequently, *he shall professe himselfe to be sent from God*; for what knoweth M. *Downam* whether he will say, that he is their God himselfe, not sent by any other person, for that he will deny the Trinity: or, though at the first he should deale otherwise, it is certaine, that at length, he will extoll himself aboue all Gods, as S. *Paul* saith, and consequently then he will professe himselfe to come in his owne name, for that he acknowledgeth no Superiour or equall, in whose name he should come. To the fourth Confirmation he answereth, that *because our Saviour speaketh conditionally and indefinitelie, there is not so much as any shew of reason in it.*

(If) *for* (when) *Esay.* 4. 4. *Ioan.* 14. 3.

VIII.

VIII.

But

But *Bellarmine* proued, that our Sauiour ſpake definitely of the cheife and proper Antichriſt, and though he ſpeaketh conditionally, his confirmation is in force, for that hindereth not the particularity of him, whom he ſpeaketh of.

IX.

3. About the ſecõd place, *M. Downã* taketh occaſiõ to ſhew his skill in Greeke & maketh a large diſcourſe, that many tymes, the greek article doth not ſignify a particuler thing, which both *S. Epiphanius* & *Bellarmine* knew aſwel as himſelfe. 2. *Theſſ.* 2.

4. But when he commeth to that part of *S. Epiphanius* his obſeruation which maketh to the purpoſe, he hath little to ſay againſt either of them both. For *S. Epiphanius* his rule, as *M. Downã* interpreteth it, is this: *VVhere the article is added vnto ſome definite and notable thing, there is alway confirmation by the article.* which confirmation he will haue to be, that the word is not to be vnderſtood indefinitly or indifferently of any. Which interpretation cannot ſtand with *S. Epiphanius* his wordes, which doe ſuppoſe, that there is no doubt, but that the word doth ſignify of it ſelfe, ſome definite, & notable thing, and yet the article is added to adde ſome other confirmation, which can be only the particularity, as *Bellarmine* concludeth. So that *Epiphanius* and *Bellarmine* agree very well, and *Doctor Downam* cannot otherwiſe anſwere *Bellarmines* argument, but by impugning *S. Epiphanius* his rule, which he doth by deniyng two of his examples, for the other was too euident; and thoſe two he firſt refuteth by our Engliſh phraſes, in which we will eaſilie grant that *M. Downam* hath more skill then *S. Epiphanius* or *Bellarmine*, ſo that he will graunt vs, that they haue more skill then he in Greeke, out of which *Bellarmines* argument is drawen. Secondly he alleadgeth 2. *Tim.* 2. 17. ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ, *the man of God*, and *Luke* 11. 24. τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, *the vncleane ſpirit*, but theſe are frõ the purpoſe ſince that neither place ſpeaketh of the moſt eminent man of God, nor of the moſt eminent vncleane ſpirit, which is neceſſary for *S. Epiphanius* his rule, who only ſpeaketh of ἀνθρώπου, which *M. Downam* tranſlateth not well in the poſitiue degree, and cannot deny the rule it ſelfe, which is confirmed by all the examples which he bringeth of *Apoſtle, Poet, Orator*, and *VViſeman*, and the ſame is euident of *King, Man &c.* when we only ſpeake of the moſt eminent *King, Man &c.* as *S.*

Whẽ the Greek article ſignifieth a particuler thing,

Paul doth here of the moſt eminent Antichriſt. Now as for the ſecond part of S. *Epiphanius* his rule, which *M. Downam* tranſlateth thus; *but without the article, it is to be taken of any one indefinitly*, that is indeterminately, we graunt it him, when it is the name of ſome definite and moſt notable thing, of which *S. Epiphanius* ſpeaketh, but when it is only an Adiectiue, or a Pronowne, as ἄλλος is, the it is out of *S. Epiphanius* his rule, eſpecially when by ſome other circumſtances, it is ſufficiently declared, that ſome particuler perſon or thing is meant, as it happeneth in our caſe.

X. 1. Iohn 2. 5. Concerning the third place, it pleaſeth *M. Downam* to be a little merry with *Bellarmine*, ſaying, *that he thought the argument drawne from the article to good to goe for one, and ſo deuided it into two*. And yet he knew well inough that *Bellarmine* did not draw his argument from the article, but from places of Scripture, or rather bringeth many places of Scripture, to make one argument. But in good earneſt I meruaile, why *M. Downam* troubleth himſelfe ſo much with an argument already anſwered in the former: for firſt he bringeth forth 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 7. ὁ κατέχων, *he that hindereth, which ſignifieth the ſtate and ſucceſſion of the Roman Emperours*. As though this did ſignify the moſt notable Emperour, which is neceſſary for to verify *S. Ephiphanius* his rule. After this, he alleadgeth *Matth.* 1. 16. 18. ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ *vpon this rock*, by which he ſaith, *the Papiſts vnderſtand the whole ſucceſſion of Popes, and yet there is not only the article, but alſo the pronowne demonſtratiue*. But *M. Downam* ſhould haue conſidered, that the Papiſts do not otherwiſe vnderſtand the place of the whole ſucceſſion of Popes, then by a neceſſary conſequence, that whatſoeuer is giuen to one Pope, is giuen to all, and ſo this ſpeach being vſed to *S. Peter*, as Pope, is by conſequence to be vnderſtood and verifyed of all the reſt. After this, he commeth back againe to 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 3. which he had handled ſo largely before, and ſaith, *that ſome doe vnderſtand the Man of Syn, of the whole multitude of thoſe who ioyne with Antichriſt*, and addeth, that *Auguſtine reciteth this opinion, and is ſo far from miſliking it, that Bellarmine alleadgeth it as Auguſtines*. At which ouerſight of his I much meruaile. For neither doe thoſe Authors ſpeake of the *Mã of ſinne*, but of the Apoſtaſie or reuolt: nor doth *Bellarmine* attribute the opinion to *S. Auguſtine*

Downam miſtaketh Bellarmine and S. Auguſtine.

ſtime, as *M. Downam* or any other may eaſily ſee, if it pleaſe them to looke vpon the place in this Chapter, §. XXIII. yet *M. Downam* goeth on with his examples of *the VVoman*, and *the Harlot* out of the *Apoc.* 12. 6. and 17. 1. 18. by which are ſignified *the Church of Chriſt, and the Cittie or Church of Antichriſt*. And yet he cannot chooſe but know, that firſt they ſignify thoſe women, which were ſhewed to *S. Iohn* in the forme of particuler VVomen: and beſides that which is ſignified by the women, is alſo as particuler, as the nature of thoſe thinges doe permit, the Church of Chriſt in that tyme, of which *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh, and the materiall Cittie of *Rome*, which is a particuler Cittie.

6. At length he commeth to the place which *Bellarmine* citeth, and he maketh the Apoſtle to reaſon thus: *VVhen the Antichriſt is come, it is the laſt houre, now Antichriſts are come: therfore now is the laſt houre.* Where I meruaile how he durſt be ſo bould with the holy Scripture, as to change (*commeth*) into (*is come*) If he ſaith that *S. Iohn* might not haue 4. * termes in his argument, he ſhould rather haue ſaid, that *S. Iohn* did not argue at leaſt in forme, but rather that he did vſe a more briefe and compendious manner of reaſoning, by putting downe two arguments, almoſt in two lines, as indeed he doth. For if *M. Downam* will needes bring it into forme, it is thus: *VVhen the great Antichriſt commeth, it is the laſt houre. But now he commeth. Ergo &c.* the minor which might ſeeme obſcure he proueth thus: *The great Antichriſt is then ſaid to come, when many are become Antichriſts. But we ſee many ſuch now. Ergo &c.* And then he repeateth his former concluſion: *Therefore it is the laſt houre.* After this, *M. Downam* goeth to the 22. *v.* where *S. Iohn* ſaith: This is the Antichriſt, ὁ ἀντίχριστος, *which denyeth the Father and the Sõne.* Out of which there can no more be gathered, then that Antichriſt ſhall deny both the Father and the Sonne: for *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh not generallie *of euery one, that denieth Ieſus to be Chriſt*, as *M. Downam* affirmeth. Likewiſe *Cap.* 4. 5. *S. Iohn* only affirmeth, that it is the ſpirit of Antichriſt to denie Chriſt, and that he was to come in himſelfe, and was then in the world in his members: and the like he repeateth *Epiſt.* 2. *v.* 7. that all thoſe which denied Chriſt to be come, were members of the chiefe Seducer and Antichriſt, which was

1. Ioan. 2. Downam corrupteth the text of Scripture.

* termini.

1. Iohn 4. 3.

2. Iohn 7.

to

to come after, and teach that doctrine more then any of the former. The reſt which *M. Downam* hath in this place, be the obiections which *Bellarmine* maketh, & ſolueth, as we ſhall ſee not long after.

XI. 7. To the fourth place M. *Downam* anſwereth, *that Daniel ſpeaketh not of Antichriſt at all*, which he proueth by the authoritie *of the learned of our times*, but nameth not any: perhaps be-
Dan. 7. 11. & 12. cauſe he was aſhamed to oppoſe them to thoſe, which *Cardinall Bellarmine* cited, eſpecially to his good Maiſters *Caluin*, *the Magdeburgenſes*, and *Beza*. After ward he proueth the ſame
Downam peruerteth Daniel egregiouſly. with reaſon, *for that Daniel deſcribeth him*, whome *M. Downam* will haue to be *Antiochus* only *as the tenth*, and *Cardinall Bellarmine maketh him the eleauenth*, *as if it were a beaſt of eleauen hornes*: which truly is a ſtrãge bouldnes in *M. Downam*, the words of *Daniel* being ſo cleere: for hauing ſaid *Cap.* 7. *v.* 7. that the fourth beaſt had ten hornes, he forthwith added *v.* 8. *Conſideraban cornua, & ecce cornu aliud parualum ortum eſt de medio eorum &c. I did conſider the hornes* (no doubt the ten, which he had ſaid that the beaſt had) *and behould another little horne roſe vp in the mydſt of thẽ*, ſo that he diſtinguiſheth it frõ the other ten by three notes. 1. calling it another. 2. a little one, no doubt in reſpect of the other ten: and 3. that it roſe vp in the midſt of them, ſignifying that they appeared before this: and that it was not the tenth may alſo be gathered, by that it aroſe in the midſt, and not in the ſame place, as it ſhould haue done, if it had ſignified one of the ten Kings of the *Seleucida* and *Lagida* in *Syria* and *Egipt*, as *M. Downam* would haue it. Where we may alſo note that theſe 10. Kings were all of diſtinct Prouinces, and at one time, for otherwiſe this laſt horne could not haue riſen in the midſt of them. And againe v. 20. he that expounded the viſiõ to *Daniel* ſaith thus; *Et de cornibus decem, quæ habebat in capite, & de alio quod ortũ fuerat &c. And of the ten hornes, which he had on his head, and of the other which aroſe &c.* cã any thing be more plaine, thẽ that the other which aroſe was none of the ten? But v. 24. more plainly, *porrò cornua decem ipſius regni decem Reges erũt, & alius conſurget poſt eos, & ipſe potentior erit prioribus &c. Moreouer the ten hornes of his kingdome, ſhalbe ten Kings, and another ſhall ariſe after them, & he ſhalbe more potent thẽ the former &c.* Now whata ſtrange man

is

is M. *Downam* to ſay, that he is the tenth. And by this it is eaſy to gather how true his expoſition is in the reſt, as that thoſe 10. Kings *ruled ſucceſſiuelie ouer the Iewes*, and *that 6. for the moſt part were dead before the 10. was borne*, of which we ſhall haue occaſion to ſpeake hereafter. Now it is ſufficient to note, that *Bellarmine* addeth that of the ſubduing ſeauen, out of the 12. 13. and 17. of the Apocalyps, togeather with the 7. of *Daniel*, for in all thoſe places there is mention made of the 10. hornes, but with this difference, that in the 12. chap. of Apoc. 3. v. there be togeather with the 10. hornes, 7. heads, with 7. diadems, & in the 13. there be alſo 7. heades, & vpon the hornes 10. diadems; of which difference in the diadems, that in the former place they be but 7. and in the latter ten, the reaſō is, for that Antichriſt ſhall kill three Kinges, and ſo there ſhall only 7. remayne. But of this wee ſhall likewiſe haue occaſion to ſpeake more heereafter. Now therefore, let vs goe forward with *M. Downam* who ſaith, that if *Antiochus* be ſpoken of, and Antichriſt be by him figured, it followeth not, that Antichriſt ſhalbe a particuler man, as *Antiochus* was, for that *the likenes doth not hould in all thinges, but only in thoſe in reſpect whereof the type is a figure, as the high Prieſt of the Iewes was a figure of Chriſt*, and yet *they were many. Melchiſedeth was (as Papiſtes ſay) a figure of theyr Prieſtes*, and yet *was but one. Ioſuah, Dauid & Salomon types of Chriſt*, and yet *not like him in all.* As though *Bellarmine* ſaid, that Antichriſt ſhalbe like *Antiochus* in all thinges, or in any other thing, then that which is ſet downe in the Scripture, and confirmed againe in the new Teſtament, & ſo vnderſtood by the Fathers, as in his victories, and ſuch other circumſtances, that cannot agree to many, but only to one particuler man as *Antiochus* was, and Antichriſt ſhalbe.

Chap. 16.

Chap. 16.

8. To the 5. place *M. Downam* anſwereth, that *S. Iohn* & *Daniel* ſpeake of diuers matters. For confirmation wherof he denieth againe the 11. horne in Daniel, adding this proofe, *that otherwiſe the 4. beaſt, were a beaſt of 11. hornes.* To which it is eaſie to anſwere, that before that little horne aroſe, that beaſt is deſcribed with 10. hornes, and after he had but 7. left, for three of them were pulled vp by this little horne, and by this all the difference he putteth betwixt the 10. Kinges in

XII.

Apoc. 13. 17.

See cap. 16

Daniel and *S. Iohn* is ouerthrowne. After he commeth to the tyme of the persecution of *Antiochus* & Antichrist, & for the former he graunteth, that it endured only from *the* 15. *day of the moneth* Casleu, *in the* 145. *yeare of the Kingdome of the* Seleucidæ 1. *Macab.* 1. 57. *vnto the* 25. *of the moneth* Casleu, *in the yeare* 148. 1. *Macab.* 4. 52. *which make* 3. *yeares and ten daies*, which is all *that* Daniel *assigned by a time, and times, and parcell of a tyme*. Where he maketh bould with *Daniel*, changing halfe a tyme vnto a parcell of a tyme: for the Prophet saith plainly both *cap.* 7. v. 25. *vsque ad tempus, & tempora, & dimidium temporis*, and againe *cap.* 12. *v.* 7. he saith, *that the Angell swore by him that liueth for euer, quia in tempus, & tempora, & dimidium temporis*, and after he counteth it also by dayes, *dies mille ducentos nonaginta*, and yet all this will not keep *M. Downam* from taking away so much as he thinketh necessary, for to make his interpretation good. But when he commeth to the Apocalyps, there he will not haue the number *to be litterallie vnderstood*, because it made too much against him, who will haue Antichrists raigne to endure many hundred yeares, & not only 42. monethes, as S. Io. affirmeth *cap.* 13. v. 5. which *cap.* 12. *v.* 6. he counteth also by daies 1260. and *v.* 14. with the verie same wordes of *Daniel*, *a tyme, and tymes, and halfe a tyme*: and *v* 12. *a little tyme*, which is the *short tyme* he also speaketh of *cap.* 17. *v.* 10. Lastly he commeth to the Fathers, and it is strãge to see how light he setteth by their authority, saying, *that no sound argument can be drawen from it*: and yet he would make a shift to seeme to say something, repeating that which he had said before, that the Fathers *doe not expressly say, that he shalbe but one*, and then, that some of them *doe expound Matth.* 24. (where our Sauiour speaketh in the plurall number) *of Antichrist*. To both which I haue already answered, that the Fathers vse other wordes equiualent, and the place of *S. Matth.* is chiefly to be vnderstood of the chiefe and proper Antichrist. Finally he would faine shift of those two proprieties of Antichrist, which *Cardinall Bellarmine* alleadgeth out of the Fathers, in his proofe: and to the first, though faintly he affirmeth, that it might all be said *of the whole successiõ of Popes*; but he saw himselfe how false that was & therfore he would haue willingly denyed the assertiõ of

Downam corrupteth the text of Daniel. Dan 7. & 12.

See cap. 8.

XIII. Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

of the Fathers, and yet he durſt not aduenture vpon that neither, ſaying, that *he will not thereof diſpute*. Where it is pitifull to ſee how poore *M. Downam* was met withall on euery ſide, and remained ſo perplexed, that he could not tell which way to turne himſelf. But when he commeth to the ſecond proprietie, he ſaith, that he will take heed, how he commeth any more into ſuch perplexity, and ſo he thinketh better to craue pardon for this tyme, and referre it till another meeting, at which you ſhall heare what he will be able to ſay for himſelfe. In the meane tyme, he will trie his cunning, whether it will ſerue him to reach *Cardinall Bellarmine* one little veny at the leaſt, ſince he hath byn ſoundly thwaked & cudgelled by him, and at laſt made to run out of the battaile with a broken head; and ſo he layeth downe his defenſiue weapons, and betaketh himſelfe to the offenſiue, bringing the arguments which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth out of other Heretikes, as though they were his owne. *See cap. 8.*

9. And yet he would faine ſeem to add ſomething to the force of the firſt argument: and for this purpoſe he maketh a *Conference* betwixt *Paul* and *Iohn*, and in the margent citeth 3. places out of *S. Iohns* Epiſtles, & after putteth the argumẽt in forme, but in ſubſtance addeth nothing at all, but rather weakeneth it much by a new interpretation of his owne, how our Sauiour ſhall kill Antichriſt with the ſpirit of his mouth, *that is* (ſaith he) *with the miniſtrie of the word*: & ſo it ſhall not be neceſſarie to expect our Sauiours cõming to kill him, for that *M. Downam*, and his fellow Miniſters of the Word, will take the matter vpon themſelues, But then I aske *M. Downam*, how he knoweth that Antichriſt ſhall continue to the end of the world, in which the force of the Argument conſiſteth? III. 1. *Iohn* 4. 3. 2. *Io.* 7. 1. *Io.* 2. 18. Downam weakneth his fellowes argument.

10. After this, he beginneth to reply to *Cardinall Bellarmines* anſwere, ſaying, that *he cannot deny either the propoſitiõ or the aſſumption*, & that *he only diſtinguiſheth of the former part of the aſſumption*: which I cannot thinke that *M. Downam* ſaid for any diſgrace to the ſolution; for if there be any fault in that kind of anſwering, it will redound to the diſputer, who committeth a vice in arguing which is called Equiuocation, & the anſwerer that findeth it out, is worthie of cõmendation. But XIV.

M. Downam goeth about to ouerthrow the distinction, with impugning first the explication, which *Bellarmine* vseth by the similitude of Christs comming, which it pleaseth *M. Downam* to call his *first proose*, and to note out of *Plato*, *that it is a most slippery argument*. But neither *Plato* nor he will deny, but that it is a good kind of explication, which is all that *Bellarmine* vsed it for, as *M. Downam* might haue easily considered, seeing *Bellarmine* begin to proue in two sortes straight after. But you must giue one, that hath an ill cause in hand leaue to seeke to help himselfe by all the trickes, and fetches he can inuent, for it was not without a further purpose, that *M. Downam* would needes haue *Bellarmine* proue, and not answere in this similitude, if you consider his wordes. *In which similitude* (saith he) *there is no proportion, vnlesse that which is in question be taken for graunted, namely that Antichrist is but one particuler person, as Christ is*. So that there is proportion in it, if Antichrist may be said to be a particuler person, which will be alwaies lawful for *Bellarmine*, or any other defendant to affirme, till his Aduersary driue him from that assertion by some forcible argument, and likewise to explicate in what sense he saith so, by some example, which his Aduersaries themselues cannot deny. Wherfore *M. Downam* commeth to the *protasis*, or *proposition of the similitude*, and saith plainly, *that it is vntrue*: which he proueth first, for that the *Holy Ghost maketh a kind of opposition betwixt Gods sending of the Prophets, and the comming of Christ*. As though all kind of opposition did make that proposition vntrue, or rather some kind ot opposition were not necessary to make it true, as of the figure, and that which is prefigured, the forerunner and he that is forerunner, the member & the head. Secondly for that the *Prophets or Patriarches are not any where called the forerunners of Christ*, but onely *S. Iohn Baptist*, for that he went *a little before*. So that *M. Downam* graunteth, that he who goeth a litle before, may well be said to goe before, but he that goeth farre before, may not: which is a strang affirmation. except he meaneth to make it good by affirming, that *S. Iohn Baptist* did prepare Cgrists way, because he only liued in Christs tyme, and pointed him out with his finger, which I am sure *M. Downam* will not say, and consequentlie vpon better deliberation he will

Downam taketh Bellarmines explication, & answere for his argumẽt.

Downams absurd folly.

will graunt, that Chriſt came in the Patriarches and Prophets aſwell as in *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, ſince that they went before aſwell as he, and prepared alſo the way for Chriſts comming: and there is aſmuch oppoſition made betwixt *S. Iohn Baptiſt* and our Sauiour, as betwixt him and the Patriarches or Prophets. After this, he maketh an idle obiectiō of his owne, & anſwereth it as ſleightly, both which I leaue alſo to himſelfe to conſider. Laſtlie he commeth to the *reddition* or *application*, which he ſaith *is contradictory* to 1. Io. 4. 3. 2. Io. 7. who ſaith, *that Antichriſt with the article prefixed, and whome they heard was to come, was already come*: which you heard *Bellarmine* graunt with a diſtinction, not in his owne perſon, but in his forerunners, and now *M. Downam* proueth it very ſubſtantially, by repeating the former argument for want of another, and ſo he ſtandeth at a *non plus*, only he confirmeth it by the argument, which *S. Iohn* maketh 1. Io. 2. 18. which I haue put downe & cōfuted in the anſwere to the third place of Scripture, whither I remit the Reader, not to weary him with ſo many idle repetitions of the ſame thing, as *M. Downam* maketh, which alſo I meane (God willing) to obſerue hereafter. *Nu. 6.*

11. To the firſt proofe of *Bellarmines* anſwere, he reiecteth the former interpretation of thoſe 3. Fathers *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Chryſoſtome*, and *S. Hierome*, by his owne abſolute authority. For when he began to thinke how he might deceaue ſome of the ſimple ſort, by making a ſhew that the Pope is Antichriſt, he did put this downe for a chiefe Principle, that Antichriſt ſhould be no open, but a diſguiſed enemy, and a pretended Chriſtian: and this he wil defend againſt all the Fathers, yea againſt the Apoſtles, & Chriſt himſelfe, though with this difference, that againſt the Fathers, who without all doubt, were the members of Chriſt, he oppoſeth himſelfe manifeſtlie: but againſt Chriſt and his Apoſtles onlie couertlie, by falſe expoſitions of his owne head, with which he conuinceth, that he is only a member of that great Antichriſt, and not the great Antichriſt himſelfe. But I hope well, that both *M. Downam* himſelfe and all that follow him, or ioyne with him againſt thoſe ancient Fathers the true members of Chriſt, will at length ioyne with them againſt thoſe

XV. Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

those disguised enemies and pretended Christians, of which number, they themselues are for the present. And in the meane tyme, till they amend themselues, they must giue vs leaue to thinke with the holy Fathers, that both Antichrists members, as also himselfe haue bene, and shalbe not only disguised, but also open enemies of Christ, as you see those holy Fathers affirme of *Nero* and the other of the Heretikes, who deceaue secretly, which both *M. Downam*, and we also admit. And yet we may note, that this secrecy of the Heretikes is not so great, but that many times it conteyneth manifest opposition against Christ, as we see in *Simon Magus*, who named himselfe Christ, and in *Montanus* who would needes be the *Holy Ghost*. And if *M. Downam* had rather haue new examples he may remember *George Dauid*, and *M. Hacket* with his two Prophets. But now I would aske *M. Downam*, what it maketh against *Bellarmine*, whether the members and forerunners of Antichrist be disguised or open enemies, so that it be graunted, that then there were some such, and yet the great Antichrist was not yet come, as *M Downam* himselfe confesseth, that the Antichrist κατ' ἐξοχὴν *was not reuealed* vntill 606. yeares after; so that till then Antichrist was come only after a sort, that is (as after he explicateth) in some of his members, which is all that *Bellarmine* pretended. But perhappes *M. Downam* will say, that he knew well inough what he said when he only affirmed that Antichrist κατ' ἐξοχὴν *was not then reuealed, though he were come*. But then I would aske him how he was otherwise come, then in the Heretikes his members, which is that which *Bellarmine* answereth. And if he cā shew vs no other manner, then we may see how easie a matter it is to vnderstand, that Antichrist might be so said to be come in *S. Pauls* and S. *Iohns* tyme, and yet that the chiefe & proper Antichrist, or κατ' ἐξοχὴν is not yet come in person, but shalbe one man in the end of the world.

Antichrists members sometimes open enemyes to Christ.

XVI. 12. To the second proofe. First *M. Downam* answereth, *that it cannot be proued out of Scripture, or by any sound argument, that* Peter *and* Paul *were Bishops of* Rome. For you must vnderstād that the authority of *S. Irenaus*, or of all ancient writers is of no force at all with *M. Downam*: and besides, he knoweth well inough, that *S. Paul* is said to haue byn in *Rome* in the

Downam reiecteth all ancient writers.

Scri-

Scripture, and *S. Peter* alſo, if he will ſtand to his owne expoſition of the wold *Babylon*; and ſuppoſing they were there, I hope he will as ſoone graunt them the Biſhoprick, as any other. But to let this paſſe, *M. Downam* will be twyce aduiſed before he graunt, that the Biſhop of *Rome* at that tyme (whoſoeuer he was) was Antichriſt, which is as much as *Bellarmine* would haue denied at this preſent, and *M. Downam* doth him that courteſy; yea and to agre with him in the expoſition of *S. Paul* and *S. Iohn*. For thus he writeth. *VVhen we ſay, that Antichriſt was come in the Apoſtles tyme, we ſpeake of the bodie of Antichriſt vnto* S. Iohn: *when we ſay that Antichriſt hath his ſeate in* Rome, *we ſpeake of the head of this body*: ſoe that now you ſee heer be diſtinct perſons, part of which were come, and part not come in *S. Iohns* tyme. But *M. Downam* goeth about to deceaue the Reader by telling him a lōg tale of the Pope, without any proofe, and from the purpoſe. But he muſt be put in mind to anſwer *Cathegoricè*, whether Antichriſt, that *S. Paul* and *S. Iohn* ſaith was come in their tyme, were the ſame, that was to haue his ſeat in *Rome* or noe? If he ſaith yes, then he muſt alſo graunt, that *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, or whoſoeuer had the ſeate at that tyme was Antichriſt. If he will ſtick to his noe; then it is playne, that there is no conſequence in *Bezas* argument: Some manner of Antichriſt was come in the Apoſtles tyme: *Ergo* no other, that ſhalbe only one man can come after, vnleſſe he were aliue at that tyme. Yet for all this *M. Downam* maketh the beſt ſhift he can, ſaying, that *in Bellarmines argument there is no conſequence, vnleſs this be taken for grãted, that Antichriſt is but one man*, which is the queſtion; & after he frameth arguments as it pleaſeth him. But *M. Downam* ſhould haue conſidered, that *Bellarmine* ſuppoſed not, that Antichriſt was but one man, neither was it much materiall in this place, if we ſpeake only of the chiefe and proper Antichriſt, whome *Bellarmine* only affirmeth to be one: but he ſuppoſeth that which *M. Downam* and his Maiſter *Beza* put in their probation, if they will conclude any thing, that Antichriſt of whom *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh is the ſame, that is to haue his ſeat at *Rome*, for then it followeth very well, that he in perſon had his ſeate in *Rome*: in the Apoſtles tyme, & not only in the heretikes his members. For if this ſecond were

Downam ſpeaketh from the purpoſe.

inough

inough, it were not necessary, that he himselfe should be aliue at that tyme, and consequently he might well inough be slaine at the end of the world, & yet be no very old mã neither; for that it is vncertaine, when he was to be borne. For certaine it is, that he needed not to be in *S. Pauls* and *S. Iohns* tyme, if they speake not of him in person, but onlie of some of his members, which for ought *S. Paul* and *S. Iohn* say, or *M. Downam* can proue, might be in the world before he himselfe came in person, not only manie an hundreth yeare, which *M. Downam* graunteth of 600. but also many thousands.

XVII. 13. Lastly *M. Downam* commeth to *Bellarmines* answere to the confirmation, where first he censureth that tradition, which the Fathers gather commonly out of the Scripture, that *Elias* shall come in person, before the second comming of Christ, for a *Iewish fable*: and yet doth he not so much as goe about to proue with any argument, that it shall not be soe, but only confirmeth, that *S. Iohn Baptist* was called *Elias*; and giueth the reason why he was so called, in which there is no controuersy. And at least wise he might haue vouchsafed, to haue tould vs out of his high learning, what our Sauiour meant in that place which *Bellarmine* citeth, by saying, that *Elias indeed shall come*, for this cannot be vnderstood of S. *Iohn Baptist*, who as our Sauiour affirmeth in the same place, was alreadie come: wherfore till *M. Downam* bringeth some better proofes, I take it, any wise man will not only suppose as he giueth him leaue to do, but also hold for certaine, that *Elias* shall come in person, though he be said to haue come in S. *Iohn Baptist*: for that he had a spirit like vnto his, & consequently that it is not necessary, that there shall come no other Antichrist in person, at the end of the world, because S. *Iohn* saith, that he was come in his tyme in some of his members, whose spirit was like his: for *Bellarmine* disputeth not now, but answereth by producing another place of Scripture like vnto that which is obiected, which cannot be denied to be a good manner of answering. But *M. Downam* bringeth forth a place of Scripture, where *Dauid* is promised to come after he was dead, and yet it is not vnderstood of King *Dauid*, but of *Christ*: and therfore neither is *Elias* to come

Downam censureth the Fathers.

See Chap. 6.

Elias shall come in person.

Ezech. 34.

come againe. But *M. Downam* will eaſily ſee, if it pleaſeth him to put this argument in forme (in which he ſeemeth to take particuler delight) that one may well anſwere him, *nego conſequentiam*, and withall he may note, how that name *Dauid* is ſomtime taken properly, and ſometime for a diſtinct perſon which is figured by the former, which is ſomewhat harder, then that the type ſhould take the name of the chiefe and principall in that kind, which it figureth: and as it were noe good argument to ſay, *Dauid* ſhall come, therfore he is not come, for there be two to whome the name of *Dauid* agreeth; ſo likewiſe the argument which we haue bene diſcuſſing all this while, concludeth not, ſince it is only thus: Antichriſt is already come, therefore he ſhall not come in the end of the world, for that there be more then one Antichriſt, and the chiefeſt is not come any otherwiſe yet then in his members.

14. Concerning *Bezas* ſecond reaſon *M. Downam* addeth to the 7. of *Daniel* alſo the 11. and beſides the 13. and 17. *Apoc.* and ſaith that in all theſe places *vnder the name & figure of a beaſt is not deſcribed one ſingular thing or perſon, but a whole ſtate or ſucceſſion*, and in the aſſumption inſteed of 2. *Theſſ* 2. he putteth down Apoc. 13. where he ſaith, *Antichriſt is deſcribed vnder the name & figure of a beaſt*: then he proueth the propoſition by induction out of the 7. & 8 of *Daniel* and *Apoc.* 13. ſo that he hath made a new argument of his owne, for that belike he could not ſaue his *M. Beza* from abſurdities, if he ſhould haue followed his Argument againſt *Bellarmines* anſwere, and yet he putteth downe Bellarmines anſwere, as though it had bene giuen to this new Argument, which he hath coyned himſelfe. In which he ſheweth leſſe vpright dealing then *Bellarmine* doth, with the Scriptures, by ſaying, that in the 8. *Chap.* of *Daniel* the Ram and the Goat ſignify but two ſeuerall Kinges, which M. *Downam* thinketh to be againſt the Scripture, for that in the 20. *v.* where the viſion is expounded, there is in Hebrew, the word Kinges, in the plurall number, and for that afterward *Daniel* addeth of the Goat, that *the great horne which was betwixt his eyes is the firſt King namely Alexander*, and conſequently the Goat, whoſe horne this was, could not be the ſame *Alexander*. For the firſt part of which obiection M. *Downam*

IIII.

XVIII.

Downam cannot defend Beza.

Downam applieth Bellarmines anſwere to a wrong argument. *Dan.* 8.

nam muſt be content, that we attribute aſmuch to *S. Hierome* both in skill in the Hebrew tongue, and in Scripture, as to himſelfe, and *S. Hierome* tranſlateth the Hebrew word in the ſingular number, *Rex Medorum eſt, atque Perſarum*: ſo that either he thought that the plurall number was put for the ſingular, as it is vſuall in Scripture, or els in the Hebrew text in his tyme, it was alſo in the ſingular number: and the firſt reaſon hath the more probability in this place, for that *Darius* was in effect two Kings, ſince he had two Kingdoms, which is alſo ſignified by the two hornes, which the Ramme had. And this is ſo much the more plaine for that it is manifeſt, that he who was ouerthrowne by *Alexander* was no other then *Darius* one King, as we read in 1. *Machab.* 1. and *Iuſtine lib.* 11. and *Plin. lib.* 10. *cap.* 7. doe alſo teſtify. Now for the ſecond part, *M. Downam* might eaſily ſee, that both the Goat, and the horne being called a King in the ſame 21. *v.* either doe both ſignify *Alexander*, or elſe if the one doe ſignify the King, and the other the Kingdome, he muſt giue vs ſome reaſon, why rather the former ſhould be taken for the kingdome, then the latter, eſpecially ſince we ſee in the ſame Chapter, that by the two hornes of the Ram, are ſignified his two Kingdomes; and beſides, it is well knowne that he who did conquer and ouercome the King of the *Medes* and *Perſians*, was no other then *Alexander*, who is alſo called *Hircus caprarum*, after the Hebrew phraſe, which ſignifieth a yong Goat (as I might proue by many examples, but that I ſuppoſe *M. Downam* to be ſo cunning both in Scripture and Hebrew, that he will not contradict it) for that he was not paſt 20. yeares ould when he began his Monarchie by his admirable victories, for which in the 5 verſe he is ſaid *to haue gone ſo ſwiftly, as though he had flowen in the ayre, and not touched the earth*. By which meanes, the litle horne which he had betwixt his eyes, that is the Kingdome which he gouerned, came to be very great & ſtrong in a ſhort ſpace & at his death was deuided into foure little ones, in reſpect of his great Monarchie, which contayned all thoſe 4. After

XIX. this *M. Downam* commeth to *Bellarmines* ſecond anſwere, to which he graunteth, that *S. Paul ſpeaketh not of any of the 4. beaſtes, ſpoken of by Daniel*, which in effect is to graunt, that

Bez. as

Bezas conſequence was nothing worth: and poore *M. Downam* had no other ſhift, but to ſay, that *noe man ſaid ſo*, becauſe he meant not to ſay ſo himſelfe. And yet to ſet the better face on it, he denieth alſo *that Antichriſt is the little horne*, as *Bellarmine* affirmeth. But he ſhould haue conſidered that the other was that which was neceſſary, that the argumēt might ſtand in force, and that now *Bellarmine* is the defendant, and therfore it is not inough for *M. Downam* to deny what he ſaith, but he muſt alſo proue the contrary. Thus much for *Bezas* argumēt which as you ſee *Bellarmine* hath ſolued euen by *M. Downams* owne confeſſion, and therfore he hath added other places of Scripture, to hould it vp from falling, or rather he hath let *Bezas* argument fall, for that it was paſt recouery, and hath patched vp another of his owne. To which I āſwere that in all the places which he citeth, only in the 7. of *Daniel*, by the beaſtes be ſignified Kingdomes; for in the 11. of *Daniel* there is not once any Beaſt named, and *Apoc.* 13. there be two Beaſtes, but the former ſignifyeth only one man *Antichriſt*, & the latter his chiefe falſe Prophet, and *Apoc.* 17. the Beaſt ſignifieth the *Diuel*. All which *M. Downam* muſt not put me to proue now, till it be my turne, and then he ſhall ſee I ſhal be better ſtored both with arugments & authority thē he is who bringeth neither. And as for the aſſumption, that in the 13. of *Apoc.* Antichriſt is the ſecōd Beaſt, I haue already denied it; for *M. Downam* was in ſome need of Scripture, & ſo he was inforced to vſe one place, both in his propoſitiō & aſſūptiō, and to thruſt in other which made nothing to his purpoſe.

15. About the third obiection *M. Downam* had little to adde, only he explaneth what a ſubſtantiall ground they haue for the expoſition of that word (*Apoſtaſy*) which is no other, but becauſe it pleaſeth them to vnderſtand it ſo. And to *Bellarmines* firſt anſwere, he ſaith: that it doth rather make againſt himſelfe, then otherwiſe, for that he cannot *inferr thence, that Antichriſt is but one Man*. As though he that anſwereth were to inferre any thing, and not only to ſhew, how his aduerſary inferreth nothing. VVherfore *M. Downam* addeth, that *rather the contrary is to be inferred: for if Apoſtaſy be put by a Metonymie of the adiunct, for the ſubiect, or rather of the effect for the cauſe, that is for the parties which doe reuolt, then it followeth, that Antichriſt*

V.

XXI.

Downam miſtaketh Bellarmine.

tichriſt ſignifieth the whole body and Kingdome of Antichriſt. In which reply of his, I can ſee no other reaſon but want of conſideration of that which *Bellarmine* hath ſaid: for the interpretation, which is giuen by him in his firſt anſwere of the word *Apoſtaſie* is onely this, *that Antichriſt is called the Apoſtaſie, for that he ſhalbe the cauſe that many forſake God*: ſo that not thoſe which forſake God, but he that is the cauſe therof, is called the *Apoſtaſie*. And ſo though thoſe that forſake God be many, yet he that is the cauſe may be only one. If *M. Downam* hath any thing to reply againſt this, eyther he muſt ſhew, that the cauſe of the *Apoſtaſie*, may not be called the *Apoſtaſie*, or elſe, that one man may not be the cauſe that many forſake God, and not ſpeake ſo confuſedly and darkly as he doth, leaſt he make men thinke that he vſeth that art, to ſeeme to ſay ſomthing, when he hath nothing to ſay indeed, which may be alſo ſuſpected, by that which he addeth out of *S. Auguſtine* of an opinion which he miſliketh not, and which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth in his third anſwere, as alſo of Antichriſts ſitting in the Church; all which he knoweth well inough to make nothing to the force of this argument, nor to be againſt this firſt anſwere of *Bellarmine*, and therfore is but an idle addition for want of matter to the purpoſe. About the ſecond reaſon, that *Bellarmine* giueth, why Antichriſt may be called the *Apoſtaſy*, *M. Downam* hath nothing to ſay againſt it, but only noteth, that ſeeing none can be an Apoſtata which hath not bene a Chriſtian, Antichriſt ſhal not be a Iew, but a back ſliding and reuolted Chriſtian: which if we take the name properly, as it ſignifieth one that falleth from Chriſt, is a probable argument, that Antichriſt ſhalbe baptized: but yet he may be a Iew, both by birth, as alſo by profeſſion, as *Iulian* was a Gentile in profeſſion, and yet a notable *Apoſtata*. But this name may alſo be vnderſtood of thoſe which fall from God, though they were no Chriſtians. And in this ſeſe it is more ample, and therfore more fit for Antichriſt, who ſhall not only oppoſe himſelfe to Chriſt, but alſo extoll himſelfe aboue all that is called God. And this is all, that *M. Downam* replyeth to *Bellarmines* firſt anſwere, for he hath not ſoe much as gone about to proue, that Antichriſt may not be vnderſtood by the *Apoſtaſy*, becauſe he ſhalbe the cauſe that many

Downam ſpeaketh from the purpoſe.

Antichriſt ſhalbe an Apoſtata.

many forſake God, or becauſe he ſhalbe a moſt notable *Apoſtata*; nor that one man may not be called ſoe for theſe two reaſons, which be only the points that could make againſt *Bellarmines* anſwere.

XXII.

16. To the ſecond anſwere *M. Downam* replieth firſt, that *the diſſention of the Fathers, proueth that their expoſition can be noe good rule of interpreting the Scriptures*. Which note I would he would applie to himſelfe, and his fellow-Miniſters: for no doubt he would find, that their expoſitions are not much worth, ſince they agree ſo little; and if when the Fathers doe diuerſly expound the ſame place, it is a ſigne, that it is not certaine which interpretation is to be followed, but that either may be admitted, ſo far as they ſwarue not from any point of Faith; how much leſſe certainty can we haue of *M. Downam* and his fellowes, who many tymes doe not only differ from all others, but alſo among themſelues, and that in matters which belong to Faith, in which one houldeth againſt the other, and both againſt all the world beſides? After this *M. Downam* goeth about to prooue that the *Apoſtaſie* cannot ſignifie the reuolt from the *Roman* Empire, becauſe *in other places of Scripture, it ſignifieth a falling away from God*: and for that, *afterward it is called the myſtery of iniquitie, which was working in, and by the heretikes of thoſe tymes*, and becauſe *S. Auguſtine* expoundeth it ſo. All which, as you ſee, doe only confirme the former expoſition, but nothing impugne this latter, ſpecially ſince *M. Downam* confeſſeth himſelfe, that the defection from the *Roman* Empire was to goe before Antichriſts comming, and ſo this expoſition contayneth nothing againſt Faith, and cõſequentlie may be probablie defended, which is inough for to ſolue the argument, eſpecially ſince it cannot be denied, but that the word may haue this ſignification; and S. *Pauls* drift and context doth fauour this explication, for that he giueth reaſons, why the comming of Chriſt was not to be thought ſo neere at hand, as ſome gaue out: which he doth more fullie, if we vnderſtand it after this manner, eſpecially ſince, as concerning Antichriſt, he ſpeaketh plainely inough after. As for *the myſterie of iniquitie* which *M. Downam* will needes haue to be all one with the *Apoſtaſie*, or departure, it is manifeſt that they be two diſtinct thinges, for that

The Proteſtants expoſitiõ of Scripture not much worth.

The apostasie and the Mystery of Iniquitie not all one. *See cap. 14. 11. 3.*

S. Paul supposeth euidentlie *v.* 3. that the reuolt was not yet come, and *v.* 7. he affirmeth plainely, that the mysterie of Iniquitie did worke then. *For now (*saith he*) the mystery of Iniquity worketh, only that he which now houldeth, doe hould vntill he be taken out of the way, and then that wicked one shalbe reuealed.* In which words he seemeth to repeat that, which he had said before in other wordes, assigning plainlie the tyme of Antichrists comming, by the taking away of him, which houldeth, that is, the *Roman* Emperour; and consequentlie it is verie probable, that he meant the reuolt from him before, by the *Apostasie*, which the latin Interpreter considering, did not retaine the Greeke worde *Apostasia*, which seemeth to be more appropriated to the falling from God, but translated it *Discessio*, which may very well be applied to this other. Now it is no meruaile, that *S. Augustin* fauoureth the other expositiō, which he taketh for the best, but yet he refuteth not this: & it is his rule, that when diuers expositions be cōformable to Faith, they are all to be admitted, as *Bellarmine* admitteth them. But *M. Downam* will disprooue and disallow of what misliketh him, or hindereth his heresies, and this with his owne priuate, but yet most absolute authoritie, which he presumeth the holie Ghost hath giuen him in all such affaires. But the best is, that all men are as free from obligation to belieue him, as he and his fellowes are readie to take so much vpon them.

How far diuers expositions are to be admitted.

Aug. lib. 12. Confes. cap. 31.

XXIII. Downams *petitio principij*

17. To the third Answere *M. Downam* replieth, *that the euent hath shewed, that this generall reuolt hath byn made by little & little.* To which (to answere him in forme) I denie his Antecedēt for that it is the chiefe matter in controuersie, and therfore should not haue bene taken for the Antecedent, but for the Consequent. Next he saith, *that as this reuolt did grow by degrees; so it cannot be abolished at once, but by degrees, and therefore was not like to be an Apostasy of three yeares, and a halfe only.* To which I answere that if it did not grow by degrees, then it maie be abolished at once, and therfore is like inough to be an *Apostasie* of three yeares and a half only. Besides that, it is not necessarie, that it should be so long in abolishing, as it was in growing, especiallie when God himselfe taketh the matter in hand, and vseth his absolute power, as he will doe in this case, as *S. Paul* te-

teſtifieth 2. *Theſſ.* 2. Thirdly he draweth an argument from the conuerſion of the Iewes, whom he ſaith, *neither our Sauiour as he was a man, and the Miniſter of Circumciſion, nor the Apoſtles and other Diſciples could for many yeares conuert, notwithſtanding their doctrine and miracles were more effectuall and admirable, then thoſe of Antichriſt.* Where firſt *M. Downam* is verie bould with our Sauiour, though he ſpeake of him only as man, limitting his knowledge and power to that only which he did: whereas the rule therof is farre different, except *M. Downam* doth alſo thinke, that he had not all perfect knowledge, and power from the beginning, which I will not charge him with all, vntill I heare him ſay ſo, for that I haue a better opinio of him, then that he will fall into ſo great folly or blaſphemy. Wherfore I doubt not, but that he will eaſily ſee, that our Sauiour taught and wrought according to that which was ſet downe by the heauenly wiſdome of his Eternall Father, who gaue to the Iewes ſuch outward meanes, as were very ſufficient in that kind to haue drawne them to acknowledg and receaue their true *Meßias*; but yet no doubt, could haue taught them more plainly, and not in Parables, as our Bleſſed Sauiour ſaid, and did alſo to his Apoſtles, and likewiſe could haue wrought greater miracles, as well as the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors, but he wrought thoſe which were determyned to be wrought in that tyme, and which were foretould in the Scriptures, & denied flatly to work ſome other, as to giue them ſignes from Heauen, and to come downe from the Croſſe. But beſides theſe outward meanes, he vſed other inward, which are far more effectuall, and therfore I meruaile much, that *M. Downam* forgot them, for I will not ſuſpect, that he was either ſo ignorant as not to know them, or ſo addicted to *Pelagius* as to deny them: and yet in theſe alſo he vſed ſuch moderation as on the one ſide, the Iewes had no want of them, if they would not haue bene wanting themſelues, and yet our Sauiour could haue giuen them far greater inward helpes then he did. Neither muſt *M. Downam* vrge his diſtinction too far of *Chriſt as Man*; for either it will prooue too much, or nothing at all. For if he ſpeake of the humanitie of Chriſt, conſidered in it ſelfe, and not as the inſtrument of his Diuinitie, then he could

Chriſtes knowledg & power, is not to be limited by that which he did.

could not doe any miracle at all of those which he actuallie did; and therefore I alway suppose, that *M. Downam* speaketh not in this base and vnworthy sense, by which Christ is considered, not only as man, but also as if he were no more, nor no better then a pure man; but if it be considered, as the instrument of his Diuinity, then his power extendeth it selfe so farre, as the power of God himselfe, though actually he putteth not all in execution, but only that which Gods eternall wisdome hath appointed. But now to *M. Downams* reply, I graunt the Antecedent, but deny the Consequent, cheifly, for that we haue sufficiet ground to think so, though we could not vnderstand the reason of it: and besides, that very obstinacy of the Iewes doth giue a sufficient cause of this euent. For if, being assailed by such effectuall and wonderfull meanes, as the doctrine and miracles of Christ, his Apostles and Disciples were, notwithstanding it was forcible inough to keep them in their former synnes, and to draw them into farre greater; what meruaile is it, that being destitute of such extraordinary helpes, and set vpon by Antichrist and his followers, who shall abound with all power and deceitfull meanes, and such especially as they expect; that they yield vnto his doctrine, & take him with one accord to be the *Messias*, whom they haue so long expected. And as for the rest of the world that shall ioyne with him, it shall not come, especially at the first, so much for the liking of his doctrine, as for desire of liberty, coldenes of charity, and abounding in synne, which be the chaines by which men are drawen into errours, heresies, and infidelity, as both our Sauiour and *S. Paul* teach, and the experience of all ages, and particularly of this of ours, doth manifestlie shew, which I could wish *M. Downam* and others of his mind to consider attentiuely, & they may perhaps come to know more plainely, the ground of their new ghospell, by this consideration duly weighed, then by all the bookes that they can read written, eyther for it, or against it. And besides *M. Downam* may consider what great ouerthrowes in Faith, temporall commodities and persecution will cause, of which he may also find store of examples in this our miserable Countrey, where no small multitudes ioyne with Protestants

How Antichrist shall draw men to follow him.

ſtants, only for theſe reſpects, as would eaſily appeare, if it would pleaſe his Maieſty to giue all men liberty to vſe their conſcience, and profeſſe the Religion which they beliue in hart to be true. Laſtly *M. Downam* taketh vp *Bellarmine* very ſhort, for abuſing the authority of *S. Auguſtine*: and yet with reading the place in *Bellarmine* he ſhould haue ſeene, that *Bellar.* ſaith only, that *S. Auguſtine* writeth, that the place of *S. Paul* was ſo vnderſtood by many ancient writers: ſo that in this *M. Downam* delt very hardlie with *Bellarmine*; but after abuſeth not only *Bellarmine*, but alſo thoſe Ancient writers, and *S. Auguſtine* himſelfe, by affirming, *that they only ſpeake of the myſtery of Iniquity, teaching that it ſhould ſtill worke, that is, that vnſound men in the church ſhall more & more reuolt, vntill they make a ſufficient number for Antichriſt, but that there is neuer a word of this defection cauſed eyther by one man, or in ſo ſhort a time, but rather the contrary.* The cauſe of which rath aſſertion is his miſtaking, for *Bellarmine* citeth thoſe, which *S. Auguſtine* alleadgeth for the expoſition of the word *Diſceſſio*, or as he readeth it, *Tranſſuga*, by which he ſaith ſome vnderſtand not *ipſum Principem*, the chiefe Antichriſt himſelfe, but his whole body, that is, the multitude of men which belong to him, togeather with the chiefe himſelfe. By which it plainly appeareth that he ſpeaketh of the defection cauſed by this Prince; the tyme of whoſe raigne, is manifeſt in the Scripture it ſelfe.

Downam miſtaketh and abuſeth Bellar. and other Authors.

18. To the 4. anſwere, *M. Downã* replieth (hauing firſt made a parẽtheſis in *Bell.* name, as though he thought that the apoſtaſy wherof the Apoſtle ſpake, were to endure many ages, though he could not chooſe but ſee, that he thought nothing leſſe) that *this 4. anſwere is ouerthrown by the firſt*. In which he is either very ſimple, or deceiptful: for it is plaine, that whẽ one giueth diuers anſweres to one argumẽt, he is not bound to make thẽ all agree togeather, but euery one by it ſelfe. After he ſaith that he hath *ſhewed, that the whole body of Apoſtataes, and Heretikes profeſſing the name of Chriſt, is Antichriſt*, about which I remit the Reader to that, which hath bene anſwered to what he hath ſaid hitherto. Thirdly he anſwereth inſteed of replying, that *all degrees going before the reuelation of Antichriſt, were a diſpoſition not to the being, but to the reuealing of Antichriſt*: for (as *S. Iohn* ſaith) *Antichriſt was in the Apoſtaſy, neither could he be reuealed, vnles he firſt were.*

XXIV.

But to this *Bellarmine* answered long since, that Antichrist was not in the Apostles tyme in person, but only in his forerunners; and the distinction of being, and reuealing is impertinent, euen in *M. Downams* owne opinion, if he speake of the chiefe Antichrist in person, whome he will haue to haue bene reuealed so soone as he came, & so likewise were his forerunners also; which is no meruaile, if we consider, that their comming is, when they begin to teach false doctrines, by which they are also necessarily knowne to be come, to all such as know those doctrines to be false: so that it is plaine, that their comming and their reuelation is all one, as the comming of the sunne & the light, by which it is reuealed. And the like is of any thing, that is necessarylie cõioyned to some manifest token, by which it may be knowne, as heretikes and Apostataes are if they declare themselues for such by doctrine and workes, of which *M. Downam* may haue examples in his *Maisters*, *Luther*, *Caluin*, and the rest; who were forthwith reuealed to be Heretikes, so soone as they began to teach new doctrines: only it may be, that they may for some space dissemble, and seeme to be Catholikes though in hart they be Heretikes. But this maketh nothing to the purpose, for all that tyme they are not come in the sight of men, but only in the sight of God; and no man will deny, but that Antichrist may come in this sort before he begin to teach. But this is not the comming, which *M. Downam* talketh of, since he saith, that Antichrist was come in *Symon Magus*, and others who taught Heresies, and yet he will not haue him reuealed, till the chiefe Antichrist come also. After this, he citeth *Theodoretus*, who by Apostasy vnderstandeth Antichristes presence. As though *Bellarmine* had not admitted and answered that interpretation before. Lastlie he noteth for a thing verie vnlikelie, that the preparation for Antichrist should be 1500. yeares in making, & that he should continue õly 3. yeares and a half. As though the preparation for our Blessed Sauiour had not bene as long, & the tyme of his preaching and working miracles as short. Besides that Antichrist was not to come till the Ghospell of Christ had bene preached ouer all the world; & many partes fallen away fromt he Faith, which they had receaued, and

Antichrists comming & reuelation all one.

the

the reſt in great diſpoſition, by reaſon of their corrupt cuſtomes to doe the ſame. All which could not be done in few yeares, as neither was Antichriſt to be ſuffred to raigne any long tyme, leaſt he ſhould ouercome, euen the very choſen, if it were poſſible, and therfore our Sauiour was to deſtroy him in ſo ſhort a ſpace. XXV.

19. To the laſt anſwere he vaunteth, as though he had gotten a great aduantage, for that *Bellarmine* goeth ſo farre, as ſuppoſing all that which they would haue were true, yet it maketh nothing againſt vs. And heere *M. Downam* braggeth of the goodnes of his argumēt, & yet ſtraight way after he calleth it ōly *an āſwere*. But the poore mā is deceaued in thinking that when one ſaith, *tranſeat*, becauſe the argument is impertinent, that he doth it, becauſe the argument is very good, whereas indeed it is only becauſe it is nothing worth as *M. Downam* might eaſily haue ſeene in this of his, by the 4. precedent anſweres. And there can no argument be more fully anſwered, then by ſhewing, that it may be anſwered many wayes, and in all opinions. And laſtly, that though it were admitted, yet the cheife queſtion remayneth as doubtfull as before. But *M. Downam* ſaith, that none of their ſide make this argument: *Antichriſt is not one man*: Therefore, *the Pope is Antichriſt*: which becauſe he ſaith it, we will beleeue him: but then I muſt aſke him, whether any of them make this argument or noe, *The head of the generall Apoſtaſie, which endureth many yeares is Antichriſt: but the Pope is the head of this Apoſtaſie. Ergo, the Pope is Antichriſt*: for this *M. Downam* himſelfe ſetteth downe in the end of his diſcourſe: and this is the argument which *Bellarmine* anſwereth by letting paſſe the propoſition with a *tranſeat*, though it be falſe, & denying the Aſſumptiō. Downams vayne bragging.

20. And ſo at laſt *M. Downam* is content to proue it, which he doth very worſhipfully, by an argument that is called *petitio principij*, alleadging certaine points in controuerſy, and ſuppoſing that we teach falſe in them all, as about *Marriages* & *Faſtings*, though he know well inough that we allow the Sacrament of matrimony, & forbid none to marry, but ſuch as of their owne accord haue bound themſelues to the eſtate of continency: nor commaund any Faſtinges, for that we thinke any creature of God vncleane or defiled, Downams *petitio principij*

nor *adore Images as Idols, or Gods; nor refuse any part of Scripture, or admit any thing against Scripture*, as he falsely affirmeth, but onlie deny Hereticall interpretations, and admit certaine and vndoubted Traditions, and Definitions, which agree with Scripture, and are both commended, and many tymes insinuated in Scripture, though not so plainely explicated, as other pointes of doctrine, which are held, aswell by Tradition, as by manyfest Scripture, expounded by the vniforme consent of holy Fathers. But it is strange how *M. Downam* slippeth ouer that which, *Bellarmine* vrgeth against him, which is, that they haue plainely apostated from our Church, euen by their owne confession, and that they cannot shew, that euer we apostated from any Church at al; and consequently that there is farre more likelyhood, that they belong to the generall Apostasie, of which Antichrist is head, since it is plaine that in some sort they are Apostataes, then we, who in no sort can be proued to haue apostated at all.

Downam dissembleth the difficultie.

21. Hitherto you haue seene, how *M. Downam* hath replyed against *Bellarmine*. Now you shall here one obiection of his owne in these wordes: *To the 3. former arguments a fourth may be added: the 7. heads of that beast which signifieth the Roman estate, are not so many persons, but so many heades or States of gouerment, whereby the common wealth of the Romans hath ben at diuers tymes gouerned: the sixt head was the state of Emperors: the 7. Antichrist, as the Papists confesse* (for which he citeth *Rhem. in Apoc. 17.* and *Bellarmine*:) *the eight* (which also is one of the 7.) *the state of the Emperours renewed.* Wherby it euidently appeareth, not only that Antichrist is not one man, but also that the Pope (who is the 7. head) is Antichrist.

Apoc. 17.

To which I answere, that all or the most part of this exposition is false, and especiallie that which appertayneth to the present purpose. For first he bringeth neither author nor reason to proue, that those 7. heades did signifie 7. states of gouernement in *Rome*; and others as good authors as *M. Downā* doe expound it farre otherwise. Secondly, though we admit this exposition as probable, and that the head is Antichrist yet it followeth not, that he shalbe any more then one man, for he may haue a different gouernement, which is to endure

but

but only in his owne tyme, eſpecially ſince in the ſame place he is ſaid *to ſtaie a ſhort tyme*, and els where it is plainly explicated, that it ſhalbe only three yeares and a halfe; and ſo it appeareth not ſoe euidentlie, as *M. Downam* weeneth, that Antichriſt or the 7. head ſhall not be one man, euen in his owne expoſition, and much leſſ that the Pope is Antichriſt. For neither is he the 7. head, ſince the 6. ſtill remayneth; neither hath he endured a ſhort tyme, as the 7. head ſhall. And as for the 8. which *M. Downam* would make an head alſo (for which he muſt be faine to lend him his owne head, for otherwiſe there wilbe only 7. found in the Scripture) it is manifeſt, that *M. Downams* interpretation is moſt fooliſh, for that he maketh the beaſt with 7. heades to haue 8. and himſelfe to be one of them, and ſo to be alſo only one head, he being indeed no head at all, but a beaſt which hath 7. heads, and is ſaid to be the 8. in number, not of heads, but of diſtinct rulers or gouernours; for that he is diſtinct from all the other 7. which are called his heads, and yet is of them, as he whoſe inſtruments they haue bene, and whome he hath moued & incited to all manner of euill: which plainely diſcouereth *M. Downams* follie, in applying it to the Emperours, which now are. And ſo all his obiection is ſhewed to be friuolous, of which I ſhall haue occaſion to ſpeake heerafter, whither I remit the Reader for further prooſes.

Downam addeth an head of his owne to the 7. of the beaſt.

THE THIRD CHAPTER.

Wherein it is ſhewed, that Antichriſt is not yet come.

I. « ABOVT the third (ſaith *Bellarmine*) concerning the tyme of Antichriſts cõming, « there haue bene many falſe ſuſpicions, & « many errors, aſwell of Catholikes, as of « Heretikes; but with this difference, that « the Catholikes knowing, that Antichriſt « ſhall not come, but in the end of the « world, which is the truth, they erred notwithſtanding, « in that they thought, that the end of the world had ben neer, then indeed it was. But the Heretikes do erre, in that « they think, that Antichriſt ſhall come long before the end « of the world, and that in verie deed he is alreadie come. Let « vs therefore ſpeake of both errors.

II. « Firſt all auncient Writers, conſidering the malice of « their tymes, ſuſpected that the tymes of Antichriſt were at « hand. So the *Theſſalonians* in the Apoſtles tyme, did thinke « that the daie of our Lord drew neere, whome the Apoſtle « doth correct 2. Theſſ. 2. In like manner S. *Cyprian lib.* 3. « *ep.* 1. *Antichriſt* (ſaith he) *drawing neere, prepareth ſoldiars for the* « *battaile*. And *lib.* 4. *ep.* 6. *You muſt know* (ſaith he) *and belieue,* « *and hould for certaine, that the day of oppreſſion hath begun to be ouer our* « *heades, and the end of the world, and tyme of Antichriſt is approached. S.* « *Hierome. ep. ad Ageruchiam de Monogamia: He which d'd hould, is in* « *making out of the way, and doe we not vnderſtand that Antichriſt approa-* « *cheth? S. Gregorie. lib* 4. *ep.*38. *All thinges which haue bene foretould* « *are in doing: the King of Pride is neere*. And in his Homylies vpõ the Ghoſpells, he doth bouldly pronounce, that the end of the

the world draweth neere: but theſe were ſuſpicions, and not errors. For theſe Holy Fathers durſt not ſet downe any certaine tyme.

III. Others more bouldlie appointed a certaine tyme. One *Iudas*, as *S. Hierome* relateth *l. de Viris Illuſt.* thought that Antichriſt ſhould haue come, and the world ended the two hundreth yeare after Chriſt, who as is manifeſt, was deceiued. *Lactantius l. 7. cap. 25. diuin. Inſtit.* ſaith, *That all expectation ſeemeth to be for no more then two hundred yeares* &c. Where he teacheth that Antichriſt was to come, and the world to end within two hundred yeares after his tyme, and he liued in *Conſtãtines* tyme, in the three hundreth yeare after Chriſt, ſo that he thought the worldes end ſhould haue bene the fiue hundreth yeare after Chriſt. But he alſo was deceaued, as experience witneſſeth.

IIII. *S. Auguſtine lib. 18. de ciuitate Dei cap. 53.* mentioneth the errour of ſome others, which ſaid that the world ſhould be ended the foure hundreth yeare after our Lords Aſcẽſion, and of others, which appointed the thouſandth yeare, who were all deceaued, as it happened alſo to the Pagans, who (as *S. Auguſtine* witneſſeth in the ſame place) out of the anſwere of ſome Oracle, gathered, that Chriſtian religion ſhould endure only three hundred threeſcore and fiue years. There was alſo a Biſhop of *Florence*, about the yeare of our Lord, a thouſand an hundreth and fiue, who affirmed, that Antichriſt was then borne, and therefore that the worldes end was at hand. For which cauſe there was a Councell of three hundred and fourty Biſhops gathered at *Florence* by *Paſchalis* the ſecond Pope of that name. See the Chronicle of *Matthew Palmer*, and *Platina* in the life of *Paſchalis* the ſecond.

V. Laſtly it hath alway byn a famous opinion of many, which affirme, that the world ſhall laſt ſix thouſand yeares, ſince God created the world in ſix daies, and a thouſand yeares are with God as one daie. So teach *S. Iuſtine* Martyr *q. 71. ad Gentes. S. Irenæus lib. 5. Lactantius l. 7. cap. 14. S. Hilar. in cap. 17. Matth. S. Hierom. in Pſal. 89. ad Cyprianum*: with which doth alſo agree the opinion of the *Thalmudiſts*, who ſay, that they haue a Propheſy out of the Prophet *Hely*, by which it is affirmed, that the world ſhall endure ſix thouſand yeares.

This

VI. « This opinion cannot yet be refuted by experience, for « according to the true Chronologie or accompt of times, « there are about fiue thousand, and six hundreth yeares past « since the world was made. Wherfore *S. Ambrose* who *l. 7. in Luc.* « *cap.* 2. reiecteth this opinion, affirming that in his time there « were 6. thousand yeares past, is manyfestly deceaued. *S. Augu-* « *stines* moderation is very good, who thought this opinion « probable, and followed it as probable *l.* 20. *de Ciuit. Dei c.* 7. « Neither doth it follow from hence, that we doe know « the tyme of the last daie, for we say that it is probable, that « the world will not endure aboue 6. thousand yeares, but we « doe not say, that it is certaine. Wherfore *S. Augustine* sharpe- « ly rebuketh those, who affirme that the world shalbe ended « at some certaine tyme, since our Lord said *Act.* 1. that it doth « not belong to vs to know the tymes and moments, which « the Father hath put in his owne power. See *S. Augustine e-* « *pist.* 80. *ad Hesychium in Psal.* 89. *& lib.* 18. *de ciuitate Dei, cap.* 53. « But omitting these, let vs come to the Heretikes.

VII. « Wheras all the Heretikes of this tyme doe teach, that « the Bishop of *Rome* is Antichrist, and that he hath appeared « already, & is now in the world: notwithstanding they doe « not agree among themselues of the tyme when he appeared, « for there be six opinions of theirs.

VIII. « The first is of the *Samosatenes*, which liue in *Hungary* and « *Transiluania*, who in a certaine booke which they intitle, « *Forewarnings of Christ and the Apostles, of the abolishing the true Christ* « *by Antichrist*, do teach, that *Antichrist* appeared a little after the « Apostles time, to wit, when that doctrine began first to be « preached, that Christ is the euerlasting Sonne of God, for « they thinke, that Christ is only man, and that in God there « is only one person, and that this faith was preached by « Christ, and his Apostles: but that a little after the Apo- « stles death, the Roman Antichrist came, and hauing « abolished the true Christ, which was only man, brought « in another eternall Christ, and made a threefould God, and « a twofould Christ.

IX. « This opinion besides the arguments which afterward « we will bring against all Heretikes, is most easilie refuted « in two sortes. First, for that Antichrist when he commeth

shall

ſhall make himſelfe God and not any other, as the Apoſtle » ſaith 2. *Theſſ.* 2. but the Biſhop of *Rome*, as they themſelues ſay » hath not made himſelfe God, but preached Chriſt, and of » only man hath made him God. Secondly becauſe they ſaie, » that ſtraight after the death of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the » true faith of Chriſt was wholy extinguiſhed by Antichriſt, » and afterward in the whole world Chriſt was adored for » God. But Chriſt foretould that *the gates of hell ſhould not preuaile* » *againſt his Church, Matth.* 16. and the Angell foretould, that *Chriſts* » *Kingdome ſhould endure for euer, Luc.* 1. and *Dauid* foretould, *that* » *all Kinges ſhould ſerue Chriſt, Pſal.* 71. how therefore is it true, » that in the very beginning, the Church being yet but new- » ly borne, was deſtroyed by Antichriſt? »

X. The ſecond opinion is of *Illyricus*, who in his Catalogue » of witneſſes, teacheth that Antichriſt came, when the *Roman* » Empire began to incline to deſtruction: but it is manifeſt » that the *Roman* Empire began to decline after the tenth yeare » of *Honorius*, when *Rome* was firſt taken, that is, in the yeare » foure hundreth and twelue, as *Blondus* doth ſhew in the firſt » booke of the firſt Decade of Hiſtories, from the declination » of the *Roman* Empire. But *Illyricus* doth ſeeme to vnderſtand » this of the conception, & not of the natiuitie of Antichriſt » for he himſelfe *Cent.* 6. *Cap.* 1. in the beginning ſaith, *that An-* » *chriſt was conceaued after a certaine manner, in the beginning of the* » 400. *yeare, after quickned, formed, and nouriſhed in his Mothers wombe* » *about the fiue hundreth yeare, and laſtlie borne the* 6. *hundreth and ſixt* » *yeare, to wit, when* Phocas *graunted to the B. of* Rome, *that he ſhould* » *be called the head of the whole Church.* Againe *cent.* 1. *l.* 2. *cap.* 4. *co-* » *lum.* 438. he affirmeth, that Antichriſt *ſhould reigne, & tyranize* » *with the ſpirituall ſword, a thouſand two hundred and threeſcore yeares,* » *and with the temporall ſword* 6. *hundreth* 3. *ſcore, and* 6. *yeares, & that* » *then the end of the world ſhould come.* »

XI. He gathereth the former number, out of *Apoc.* 11. where » it is ſaid, that the tyme of Antichriſt ſhall endure *a thouſand* » *two hundred and threeſcore daies*, for *Illyricus* will haue a daie taken » for a yeare: he gathereth the latter number out of *Apoc.* 13. » where *the number of the Beaſt*, is ſaid to be 666. »

XII. This opinion may be refuted in two manners. For firſt » it followeth that Antichriſt is already not only borne, but

« also dead, and consequently that the end of the world is al-
« ready come. For the *Roman* Bishop began to haue the Tem-
« porall sword, that is, temporall dominion at least, from
« the yeare 699. for thē did *Aripertus* giue the *Cottian alpes*, where
« *Genua* is now situated to the B. of *Rome*, and afterward in the
« yeare 714. *Luitprand* confirmed that donation, as *Ado Vienensis*
« writeth in the Chronicle of these yeares, *Blondus l.* 10. *decad.* 1.
« and the *Magdeburgenses* confesse the same *cent.* 8. *cap.* 10. *col.* 685.
« and *Theodor. Bibliander*, who noteth that, *in this yeare* 714. *the first*
« *Papisticall Province was made.*

XIII. « Not long after, to wit in the yeare seauē hūdred fiftie &
« fiue, *Pipin* gaue to the Bishops of *Rome* the Exarchy of *Reuenna*
« with a great part of *Italy*, as *Rhegino*, *Ado*, *Sigebert*, *Blond. l.* 12.
« *decad.* 1. *Aemilius*, and the *Centuriators* themselues, *cent.* 8. *cap.* 10.
« *col.* 724. and *Theodor. Bibliander* in his Cronicle doe witnes. If
« therefore the Kingdome of Antichrist did begin in this 755.
« yeare, and endured 666. yeares, it ended in the yeare of
« Christ 1421. and so it is more then 150. yeares since Anti-
« christ died: and if the beginning of his kingdome be taken
« higher vp, to wit in the yeare of our Lord 699. then the
« end is to be put in the yeare 1365. and there wilbe more then
« two hundred yeares past, since the death of Antichrist.

XIV. « Perhappes, they will answere, that Antichrist shall
« not dy after the 666. yeare of his temporall kingdome, but
« shall only loose his temporall command. For since they say
« that the spirituall kingdome of Antichrist shall endure 1260.
« yeares, which should not yet be ended, though they had be-
« gun from the 606. of Christ; they must say consequentlie,
« that the spirituall kingdome of Antichrist shall indure for
« some space, after that his temporall kingdome be destroyed.
« But verilie it is absurd, and against all authors; and besides
« at least it followeth, that two hundred years past, the Popes
« should haue lost their temporall dominion, which is against
« experience.

XV. « Secondly the same error may be refuted, for that it follo-
« weth, that the *Centuriators* doe know exactly, when the
« world shalbe ended, which notwithstanding is against the
« wordes of our Lord, *Act.* 1. and *Matth.* 24. and that it doth
follow, is manifest; for they know, that Antichrist did be-

gin

gin to reigne with the ſpirituall ſword the yeare 6. hundreth and 6. They know alſo, that he ſhall reigne only 1260. years and that ſtraight after our Lord will come to iudgment, as they themſelues gather out of *S. Paul* 2. *Theſſ.* 2. & conſequently they know, that the laſt Iudgment ſhalbe in the yeare of Chriſt 1866. or if they know not this, they muſt alſo of force be ignorant, whether Antichriſt be come or noe:

The third opinion is of *Dauid Chytræus*, who in his Commentarie vpon *Apoc.* 9. doth hould with *Illyricus*, that Antichriſt appeared about the yeare of our Lord 600. & he doth manifeſtly inough ſignify, that *S. Gregory* was the firſt Antichriſtiã Pope. But vpon the 12. and 13. Chapters *Chytræus* doth not agree with *Illyricus* about the tyme that Antichriſt ſhall indure, but doth wiſely admoniſh, that it is not raſhly to be defined; and he proueth with three reaſons, that Antichriſt did appeare the 600. yeare. XVI.

Firſt, becauſe at that tyme *Gregory* eſtabliſhed the Inuocation of Saintes, & *Maſſes* for the dead. Secondly becauſe in the yeare 606. *Boniſacius* the third did obtaine of *Phocas* the title of *vniuerſall Biſhop*. He addeth a third reaſon in his Commentary vpon the 13. Chap. for that this tyme doth plainly and euidently agree with the number of the name of Antichriſt, which contayneth 666. *Apoc.* 13. XVII.

Chytræus addeth in the ſame place, that out of this ſame number of Antichriſts name, is gathered the tyme, in which Antichriſtes Kingdome was confirmed by *Pipin*, for there be almoſt ſo many yeares from the 97. yeare, in which *S. Iohn* wrote his *Apocalyps*, vntill *Pipin*, to wit 666. And in like manner that the tyme is gathered, in which the Pope was firſt deſigned and declared Antichriſt by Iohn *Huſſe*. For there be almoſt 666. yeares from *Pipin*, to *Iohn Huſſe*. XVIII.

This opinion may eaſily be refuted, for it is founded only in lies. For firſt *S. Gregory* was not the firſt, which taught to call vpon Saintes, and offer Maſſes for the dead. All other auncient writers taught the ſame, as we haue elswher demonſtrated. Now only *S. Ambroſe* ſufficeth, who liued before *S. Gregory* 200. yeares *lib. de viduis. The Angels* (ſaith he) *are to be earneſtly beſeeched, as alſo the Martyrs.* & *lib.* 2. *ep.* 1. ad *Fauſtinum de obitu ſororis. Therſore* (ſaith he) *I doe not thinke, that she is* XIX.

« *so much to be bewayled, as to be holpen with prayers, nor to be mourned*
« *for with thy teats, but that her soule be commended to God with oblations.*
« Neither did *Phocas* giue the title of *Vniuersall* to the Pope, but
« called him the *Head of the Churches*. But long before, *Iustinian*
« *ep. ad Ioannem* 2. had done this same; and before that also the
« Councell of *Chalcedon in ep. ad Leonem*: without cause therfore
« is the comming of Antichrist put in the tyme of *Phocas*.

XX. « Now that which *Chytræus* addeth of the number 666. is alto-
« geather foolish, because that number doth not precisely agree
« with the times, in which *Chytræus* would haue Antichrist to
« haue appeared, or to haue byn confirmed or declared. For
« from Christ to *Phocas* his decree, there be 607. yeares, not
« 666. from the reuelation of the Apocalyps to *Pipin*, there be
« 658. yeares: from *Pipin* to *Io. Husse* there are, as he himselfe
« saith 640. yeares. But *S. Io.* in the Apocalyps noted a precise
« number, since he addeth also the least particles. Moreouer
« *Iohn Husse* declared not first the Pope to be Antichrist: for
« *Wickliff* had done so before: yea *Iohn Husse* neuer said, that
« the Pope was Antichrist, for in the 19. article condemned
« at *Constance*, he saith, that Clergie men by their couetousnes
« prepare the way for Antichrist. Finally all *Lutherans* boast,
« that Antichrist was discouered by *Luther*.

XXI. « The 4. opinion is *Luthers*, in the Computation of tyme,
« who putteth two commings of Antichrist, one with the spi-
« rituall sword after the yeare of our Lord 600. to wit, when
« *Phocas* called the B. of *Rome* head of all Churches, where he
« also saith, that *S. Gregorie* was the last B. of *Rome*. Another
« with the temporall sword, after the yeare of our Lord 1000.
« *Bibliander* teacheth altogeather the same in his Chronicle *ta-*
« *bula* 11. & 13. wherefore in the first comming *Luther* & *Bi-*
« *bliander* agree with the *Centuriators* and *Chytræus*, excepting
« that *Luther* and *Bibliander* saie, that *S. Gregory was a good and holie*
« *Bishop*, but the *Centuriators cent. 6. cap. 1. colum. 2.* and *Chytræus*
« say, that *S. Gregorie aboue all other procured the introduction of Anti-*
« *christ, and therfore was a verie naughtie man*: which is a most hor-
« rible blasphemy. In the second comming, *Luther* and the
« *Centuriators* do manifestly disagree.

XXII. « This opinion besides the common arguments, which
« shalbe made after wardes, is easilie refuted. For altogeather
with-

without reaſon putteth *Luther* the comming of Antichriſt in the yeares of our Lord 600. and 1000. And of the firſt wee ſpake in the confutation of *Chytræus*. Of the yeare 1000. it may eaſilie be proued. For therefore *Luther* at that tyme, putteth the beginning of the temporall reigne of Antichriſt, becauſe then Pope *Gregorie* the 7. depoſed the Emperour *Henry* the 4. and had temporall dominion, and made warre. But all theſe thinges were done before alſo, for *Gregorie* the 2. excommunicated the Emperour *Leo*, and depriued him of the Kingdome of *Italie* in the yeare of our Lord 715. as *Cedrenus* and *Zonaras* teſtifie in the life of the ſame *Leo*. And wee haue alredie ſhewed, that the Biſhops of *Rome* had temporall dominion from the yeare 700. that is, three hundreth yeares before the yeare 1000.

Finally the *Magdeburgēſes* teſtifie *cent.* 8. *cap.* 10. that *Stephē* the third made warre about the yeare 750. and the ſame may be ſaid of *Adrian* the firſt, and of other their ſucceſſors. Likewiſe about the yeare 850. *Leo* the 4. an holie man, and a worker of miracles, made warre againſt the *Saracenes*, and had a notable victorie, and fortified the Cittie of *Rome* with bulwarkes and fortreſſes, and beſides compaſſed the *Vaticane* hill with a wall, which afterward of him was called the *Leonine* Citty, as almoſt all the Hiſtoriographers of that tyme doe write, and the *Magdeburgenſes* themſelues *Cent.* 9. *cap.* 10. XXIII.

The fifth opiniō is *Henry Bullingers*, who in his Preface to his Homilies vpon the *Apocalyps* writeth, that Antichriſt appeared in the yeare of our Lord 763. which opinion diſagreeth from all the former, and may eaſilie be refuted, for that it is grounded vpon a moſt weake foundation. For *Bullinger* ſaith, that in the 13. *chap.* of the *Apocalyps*, where the number of the name of the beaſt is put downe, by that number is ſignified the tyme of Antichriſts comming, that is, how manie yeares after the writing of the *Apocalyps*, Antichriſt was to come. And for that it is manifeſt out of *Irenæus lib.* 5. that the Apocalyps was written about the end of *Domitiās* Empire, that is about the yeare of our Lord 97. he gathereth, that Antichriſt was to come in the yeare 763. for ſo many there are, if 666. be addeth to 97. XXIV.

Hither may be referred the opinion of certaine Catho- XXV.

"likes, who as *Iodocus Clichoueus* rehearseth in his commenta-
"ries vpon the 28. *cap.* of the 4. booke of *S. Iohn Damascene de*
"*fide*, thinke that Antichrist so properlie called was *Mahomet*,
"because he came about the yeare 666. as *S. Iohn* foretould. But
"this reason is nothing worth. For first the *Magdeburgenses* gai-
"nesay and contend, that the number in the Apocalyps signi-
"fieth not the tyme of Antichrists birth, but the tyme of his
"death. And *S. Io.* the *Euangelist cap.* 13. *Apoc.* reiecteth both
"*Illyricus* and *Bullengers* fiction, for explicating himselfe he saith,
"that that number, *is the number*, not of the tyme, but *of the*
"*name* of Antichrist, that is, that Antichrist shall haue a name
"whose greeke letters shal make the number 666. as *Ireneus lib.*
"5. and all others expound him.

XXVI. "Moreouer this yeare 763. there was no mutatiõ made that
"we read of, in the Bishops of *Rome*, neither did *Mahomet* cõe:
"for he was borne the yeare of our Lord 597. & afterward di-
"ed in the yeare of our Lord 636. as *Palmerius* witnesseth in his
"Cronicle. Wherefore he came not to the yeare 666.

XXVII. "The sixt opiniõ is of *VVolfegangus Musculus*, who in his pla-
"ces *tit. de Ecclesia cap.* 12. affirmeth, that Antichrist came a little
"after *S. Bernards* tyme, that is about the yeare 1200. & he pro-
"ueth it, because *S. Bernard serm.* 6. *in psal.* 90. hauing reckoned
"many vices of men, and especiallie of the Clergie, and most
"greiuous persecutions of the Church, addeth; *It remayneth*
"*that the man of sinne be reuealed*. But this opinion also is easily
"confuted. For *S. Bernard* ghessed by the euills which he did
"see, that Antichrist was neere, as we also said, that *S. Cyprian*,
"*S. Hierome*, and *S. Gregory* ghessed in their tymes, and all their
"ghesses were false. Besides, there were worse Popes with-
"out comparison from the 900. yeare to the 1000. then from
"the 1100. yeare to the 1200. Wherfore if they were not Anti-
"christs, why should these be?

M. Dow-

M. Dovvnams addition, and reply confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downam* hath little to ſay, about the ancient opinions, only he affirmeth, if you will beleeue him vpon his word, that there is a great difference betwixt the *Fathers opinions, concerning the approaching of Antichriſt, which they held (ſaith he) according to the Propheſies of the Scripture* (& he citeth in the margent 1. *Io.* 2. 18. 2. *Io.* 7. 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 7. *compared with the euent: and their conceipt of Chriſts approaching vnto iudgment, grounded not ſo much vpon the Scriptures, as vpon their owne coniectures, which are confuted by experience.*

The difference betwixt Catholikes and Heretiks concerning the comming of Antichriſt.

But he might haue done well to haue diſproued *Bellarmins* diſtinction betwixt Catholikes and heretikes, which he affirmeth to conſiſt in this, that Catholikes know, that Antichriſt ſhall not come but in the end of the world: but Heretikes thinke that antichriſt ſhall come long before the end of the world: and ſoe we ſee, that all the Fathers, which thought that Antichriſt was at hand, thought the ſame likewiſe of the end of the world. So that, if they had liued ſo long that they might haue ſeene their coniectures about the end of the world confuted by experience, they would haue bene farre from *M. Downams* opinion, who thinketh that their arguments, concerning the comming of Antichriſt, are confirmed by experience. And the reaſon would haue bene, for that they would ſtill haue remayned Catholikes, who ioyne both togeather; and not haue bene of *M. Downams* crew, whome *Bellarmine* calleth Heretikes, which ſeuereth them farre aſunder. And the poore man had nothing to help himſelfe withall, but only to recite *S. Hieromes* and *S. Gregories* wordes, which *Bellarmine* had alleaged, and tooke them to be ſo plaine and eaſy (as they are indeed) that they needed no expoſition. And it ſhould ſeeme that *M. Downam* thought ſo too, and therfore he thought it neceſſary to falſifie them in his tranſlation, for, *de medio fit*, tranſlating, *is take out of the way*, wheras it being the preſet tenſe, ſignifieth only that

Downam traſlateth not well.

that it was not yet done, but was in doing, as it hath bene euer ſince; and ſo he ſhould haue tranſlated, *is in taking out of the way*, and then we ſhall eaſily anſwere to the argument, that a thing in doing is not done, and conſequently that Antichriſt is but comming, and not come. For *the remouing of the Imperiall ſeate from* Rome, *the taking of* Rome *by the* Goths, *the decay of the Empire*, are not ſufficient for *M. Downam* to make it good, that the Empire was taken away, but only that it was in taking away; that is, in decay, not ſubuerted or periſhed. And beſides, if *M. Downam* bethink himſelfe well, it wil be a litle with the ſooneſt for him and his friends (whome *Bellarmine* calleth Heretikes) to affirme, that Antichriſt was come in *S. Hieromes* tyme. As for the Scriptures, which *M. Downam* noteth, it is not neceſſary to explicate them now, ſince we haue had, and ſhall haue often occaſion to handle thē at large: only I will aske M. *Downam*, what he meant to ſay, that *Bellarmine thought to diſcredit the arguments of the Fathers, by reckoning them among erroneous conceiptes*, ſince *Bellarmine* expreſly ſaith, that the opinions of theſe Fathers, were *ſuſpitions*, and *not errors*, becauſe they durſt not ſet downe any certaine tyme?

See cap. 5. nu. 4.

VIII. 2. Now then let vs come (as *M. Downam* likewiſe inuiteth vs) to *Bellarmines* heretikes, where he taketh vpon him to defend all thoſe opinions, but the firſt of the *Samoſatenes*, whome he is content with *Bellarmine* to call heretikes, but taketh it very ill at his handes, that he would number them among Proteſtants, which notwithſtanding he hath no reaſon to do, ſince *Bellarmine* telleth but the truth, and giueth his reaſon why he doth ſo, becauſe they all agree in this, that *Antichriſt* is come, and that he is the Pope; which will be thought a greater agreement, then Chriſt hath with the wicked: which compariſon it pleaſeth *M. Downam* to vſe, though if others had done farre leſſe, he would haue bene ready to haue called it *blaſphemy*, if he be not more temperate then many of his fellow Miniſters; and beſides he might haue conſidered, that all the arguments, which *Bellarmine* vſeth againſt the *Samoſatenes*, make as much againſt the Proteſtants; ſo that his boaſting of *his men which haue ſoundly confuted their hereſies*, will ſeeme ridiculous; except they had cōfuted this opinion likewiſe, which they could not doe, except

How much the proteſtants agree with the Samoſatenes & all other heretikes.

VII.

cept they would confute themſelues. And the nippe which he giueth the *Papiſts for houlding their peace*, will make ſome thinke, that either he hath not read ſo much, as the titles of *Bellarmines* whole bookes, or els that he is very forgetfull, if not malicious, ſince it is euident, that he hath not omitted thoſe heretikes, no more then the reſt; neither in other hereſies, nor in this; in which he is as exact, as *M. Downam* can deſire, ſince he telleth vs in what they differ from him & his crew, which is but in a nice point, God knoweth (to wit in the circumſtances of tyme) if we conſider the other two mayne points, in which they agree; & beſids here *M. Downã* fayth, that *euen in the Apoſtles tymes, Antichriſt had as it were ſet his foote in the Church*, which is ſomething before that, which the *Samoſatenes* affirme, who only thinke, that he appeared a little after the Apoſtles tyme, ſo that all the fault will light vpon *M. Downam*, and his fellowes, who will needes make themſelues ſo like to thoſe, and all other heretikes, that none but themſelues can ſee any other difference among them, but materiall; to wit, that euery one choſeth this, or that matter, in which they differ from the Catholike Church: but all agree in this, that they choſe their Religion out of their owne priuate iudgments and ſpirits, by which they take vpon them to explycate the Scripture, euery one after his owne faſhion; but none of them will ſubiect their ſpirits to the ſpirit of truth, which is according to Chriſts promiſe only in the Catholike Church, and conſequẽtly they wilbe ſtill accompted formall Heretikes till they amend this generall fault of theirs.

3. Concerning the other 5. opinions which *Bellarmine* rehearſeth *M. Downam* would faine make an agreement, by affirming, *that the conſtant opinion of the learned is that of the reuealing or manifeſt appearing of Antichriſt* κατ' ἐξοχήν (for the reſt is impertinent) *there were two principal degrees, the firſt about the yeare 607. the ſecond after the yeare* 1000. Where firſt we may note, how cunningly he bringeth it in, with an (*about*) and an (*after*) both which may comprehend one or more yeares. And it muſt be no little, nor nice difference, which will breake any ſquare in this mans conceipt: but you muſt beare with him, for he was inforced to inlarge his conſcience, and to

From X. to XVII.

Downam nothing Scrupulous in his accompt.

be nothing scrupulous, because otherwise he could hardly haue made any one to agree with himselfe or any other; for they which come neerest, differ in a yeare, since *Illyricus*, *Chytraus*, and *Luther* put that title, which was giuen by *Phocas* to Pope *Boniface* the third, in the yeare 606. and not 607. as *M. Downã* doth, who leauing his Rabbines, is contẽt to ioine with *Bellarm.* in this accompt. But there is a greater difference betwixt *Luther* & *Bibliander* on the one syde, & the *Centuriators*, and *Chytraeus* on the other syde about *S. Gregory*, whether he did belong to Christ, or to Antichrist; which *M. Downam* wisely passed ouer in silence, with being content to go about. And yet he must fetch a far greater compasse to comprehend *Bullenger*, who putteth Antichrists comming more then a 100. yeeares later then any of these, so that by that word (about) we must vnderstand a 100. yeares sooner or later. And yet the word (after) hath a larger scope since *Musculus* will haue Antichrists comming to haue byn about the yeare 1200. But *M. Downam* stoutly denieth, that *Bullenger* putteth Antichrists comming the yeare 763. yet mentioneth not the place which *Bellarmine* citeth, which is as plaine, as plaine may be; but thinketh it sufficient to alledge another place out of *Bullenger*, where yet he nameth not once Antichrist, but explicateth, how in his opinion the Popes dominion increased & was confirmed; which only sheweth, that *Bullenger* either did not thinke, that Antichrists appearing, & the Popes dominion was all one, or els, that he is contrary to himselfe; of which two I will giue *M. Downam* good leaue to choose which he listeth. He would also faine excuse *Musculus*, but that the matter is too plaine; since he would found his opinion vpon *S. Bernard*, who plainly affirmeth, that he expected Antichrists appearing or reuealing, and consequẽtly thought, that he was not reuealed at that tyme: so that *Musculus* following *S. Bernard*, must needes thinke so too, howsoeuer of his owne head he addeth, that Antichrist was come, which as it is foolish in it selfe, since he could haue no certaine ground to thinke soe, vnles he had appeared in some sort: soe is it also impertinent to the matter we haue in hand, since our question is about his appearing: and they

The Protestants disagreement about Antichrists comming.

which

which put it lateſt (which are *Luther* and *Bibliander*) make him to come euen with the temporall ſword, which cannot chooſe but appeare, after the yeare of our Lord 1000. And this is *the notable conſent*, which *M. Downam* hath found *among all his writers whom* Bellarmine *alleageth in this mayne point, concerning the time of the comming of Antichriſt.*

4. After hauing laboured to make an agreemēt betwixt his Doctours, with the euent which you haue ſeene, he maketh a ſhew, as though he would anſwere all *Bellarmines* arguments againſt them, beginning thus: *Now let vs ſee what he obiecteth againſt this receyued truth*: but comming to the point he only chooſeth out *Bellarmines* anſwere to *Chytræus* his ſecōd proofe for the firſt degree of Antichriſts comming, to wit, with the ſpirituall ſword, which as you ſee is no argument at all, but a peece of an anſwere to an argument; ſo that to doe well *M. Downam* ſhould replie and not anſwere. But let vs not vrge the poore man too farre, for it is pure want, that driueth him to theſe miſerable ſhiftes. Wherefore let vs ſee, how he can auoid *Bellarmines* anſwere. *Chytræus* proofe was this. *In the yeare* 606. *Boniſacius the third, did obteyne of Phocas the title of vniuerſall Biſhop*: ergo *Antichriſt appeared about the yeare* 600. To which *Bellarmine* anſwereth in theſe words: *Phocas gaue not the title of Vniuerſall to the Pope, but called him the head of the Churches. But long before Iuſtiniā* ep. ad Ioā. 2. *had done the ſame, & before that alſo the Councell of Chalcedon* in ep. ad Leonem. *VVithout cauſe therefore is the comming of Antichriſt put in the tyme of Phocas.* To which firſt, as I haue noted, *M. Downam* ſaith, that *Bellarmine* obiected this, whereas it is moſt manifeſt that he anſwereth an obiection. Secondlie he addeth, that *good authors affirme, that he receyued from Phocas, both the title of the Head of the Church, and alſo of Vniuerſall or Oecumenicall Biſhop*: but they are too good to be named, or els *M. Downam* was aſhamed of the and therefore he muſt pardon vs, if we belieue neither him, nor them, till we know what they are. Thirdlie he auoucheth that, *there is no doubt, but that Boniſacius ſought for, and by ſuite obteyned that, which Iohn of Conſtantinople had before claymed.* But if he had remembred, what himſelfe wrote in his 1. chap. of his former booke, of *S. Gregorie* the great, his diſlike of that title in *Iohn* of *Conſtantinople*, he would haue ſeene,

Downam anſwereth when hee ſhould reply. XIX.

Phocas gaue not the title of *Vniuerſall* to the Pope, & that which hee gaue, the Pope had before.

that there had bene great doubt, whether *Bonifacius* were not more likelie to approue his holy predeceſſors iudgment in refuſing that title for due reſpectes, though otherwiſe neuer ſoe due to him, rather then his proud aduerſaries opinion in deſiring, or vſing it at that tyme, when at leaſtwiſe in that *Iohn* of *Conſtantinoples* ſenſe, it was not only ſcandalous, but perfidiouſlie falſe alſo. Wherfore keeping the dignitie it ſelfe, they vſed ſuch wordes as might modeſtlie expreſſe, what they had, and no way ſignifie that which they had not themſelues, and much leſſe *Iohn* of *Conſtantinople*, who moſt arrogantlie vſurped that falſe, and alſo fooliſh title, being taken in the ſenſe, in which he vſurped it. Fourthly *M. Downam* would ſhift of the matter, with ſaying, *that there is no great difference betwixt theſe two titles, as they are now giuen to the Pope, ſaue that to be the head of the Vniuerſall Church, is the more Antichriſtian ſtile*. But this will not ſerue his turne neither, for howſoeuer theſe titles be all one in ſubſtance, yet ſince *Chytræus* and others will giue vs a reaſon, why they aſſigne the firſt degree of Antichriſts comming in the tyme of *Phocas*; to wit, becauſe he firſt gaue the Pope the title of *Vniuerſall Biſhop*, it is not inough, when this is denied, to tell vs, that at leaſt, if he gaue him not that, he gaue him another as great: for all the force of the argument conſiſteth in this, that this title of *Phocas* is a new one, which the Pope neuer had giuen him before; for otherwiſe there is no reaſon, why Antichriſt ſhould be thought more to come in *Phocas* his tyme, then before. And this was that which *Bellarmine* anſwered, and *M. Downam* hitherto hath not ſaid any thing to the purpoſe againſt him.

See part. 2. Chap. 1.

Wherefore laſtly he goeth about to make vs belieue, that though he cannot deny, but that the Pope had the ſame title which *Phocas* gaue him long before: yet there was a great difference in the ſenſe and meaning. For he affirmeth, that *before this graunt of* Phocas, *the Church of* Rome *had the preheminence and ſuperioritie, ouer all other Churches, excepting that of* Conſtantinople, *not in reſpect of Authoritie and Iuriſdiction; but in reſpect of order and dignitie, and for this cauſe eſpeciallie, becauſe* Rome *wherof he was Biſhop, was the chiefe Cittie:* for which he citeth the *Councells* of *Chalcedon* & *Conſtantinople. And for the ſame cauſe* (ſaith he)

he) *was the Patriarch of Conſtantinople ſometymes matched with him: for* which he citeth *Concil. Chalcedon*: *ſometime preferred aboue him*; for which he noteth in the margent *tempore Maurity*, *becauſe Conſtantinople* (*which they called new Rome*) *was become the Imperiall ſeate*: yea he addeth, that *the Biſhops of Rauenna*, *becauſe their Cittie was the chiefe in the Exarchy of Rauenna*, *wherevnto Rome was for a tyme ſubiect*, *ſtroue with the Biſhop of Rome in the tyme of the Exarchies*, *for ſuperiority*. But all this diſcourſe of his, is refuted at large by *Bellarmine* in his ſecond Booke of the Pope: and if *M. Downam* will looſe ſo much labour about the anſwering of that, as he hath done about this other, which is the third, he ſhall be confuted, & I hope fully ſatisfied in this point alſo. But now it were to great a labour to put downe all *Bellarmines* proofes. Wherefore both I and *M. Downam* muſt of reaſon be content with briefly anſwering his obiections, though that alſo in truth were not to be expected in this place, but that I deſire that *M. Downam* ſhould haue no reaſon to complayne. And firſt that the reaſon, why *Rome* had the preheminence ouer all other Churches, was not becauſe it was the chiefe Cittie, as *M. Downam* would proue out of the Councels of *Chalcedon* and *Conſtantinople*, *Bellarmine* proueth by the authoritie of *S. Leo. ep.* 54. *ad Martianū*, where inueighing againſt the ambition of *Anatolius* then Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, which he had diſcouered in that very Councell of *Chalcedon* which *M. Downam* mentioneth, he hath theſe wordes. *Let the Cittie of Conſtantinople haue*, *as wee wish her*, *glorie and Gods right hand protecting her*; *let her enioy a long reigne of your Clemencie*: Alia tamen ratio eſt rerum ſæcularium, alia diuinarum &c. *Yet worldly*, *and diuine thinges haue different reaſons*: *neither will any other building be firme and ſtable beſides that rock which our Lord hath put in the foundation*. *He looſeth his owne*, *who deſireth thoſe thinges which are not his due*. *Let it ſuffice that by the foreſaid help of your Pietie*, *and by the conſent of my ſauour*, *he hath obteyned the Biſhoprick of ſo great a Cittie*: non dedignetur Regiam Ciuitatem, quam Apoſtolicā non poteſt facere Sedem, *let him not diſdaine a Kinglie Cittie*, *which he cannot make an Apoſtolicall Sea*. So that *M. Downam* in *S. Leo* his iudgment confoundeth worldlie and diuine thinges by going about to make vs belieue, that *Rome* had the preheminēce of an Apoſtolicall Sea, becauſe it was the chiefe Citty,

Downams anſwere or replie confuted by Bellarmine in other places.

The reaſon of Romes preheminence is not becauſe it is the chiefe Citty.

which as you see S. *Leo* saith, by no meanes can be. Likwise *Bellarmine* bringeth the authoritie of *Gelasius, Epistola ad Episcopos Dardaniæ*, who likewise reasoneth thus. *Millan, Rauenna, Syrmiū, Treuers and Nicomedia were the Seates of the Empire many tymes, and yet the Fathers neuer gaue any preheminence or Primacy to those Bishops, as neither they would haue done to Rome only for that respect.*

The Coūcell of Chalcedō. *See Paralelus Torti ac Tortoris cap. 4.*

And as for the authority of the two Councells, *M. Downam* must know, if he be ignorant of it, that the first of *Chalcedon* was not confirmed by *S. Leo*, but only in matters of Fayth: and in this poynt was by him expresly reiected, as may be seene in the Epistle already recited, & in diuers others *ad Anatolium, ad Pulcheriam, ad Maximum, ad Iuuenalē*. In which likewise, as also in the 16. Act of the Councell it selfe, it appeareth, that this Decree was made in the absence of the Popes Legates, who had the chiefe place in that Councell, and that they did afterward openly gainesay, and resist it.

The Canons of the 6. generall Councell.

And if by the Councell of *Constantinople* he meaneth the Canons, commonly called the *Canons of the sixt Generall Councell* (as it seemes he doth) he must likwise be tould, that those Canons, are of no accompt, as not made by that Councell, but by certaine Bishops, which afterward met priuately togeather, as appeareth by the beginning of the Canons thēselues and by the confession of *Tharasius*, Bishop of *Constantinople* in the 7. generall Councell Act. 4. and *Bede* calleth them, *Erraticam Synodum, an erring Synode*, & moreouer writeth, that *Sergius* then Pope, reiected them *lib. 6. de sex ætatibus, in Iustiniano Iuniore*. And all this, and much more to the purpose might *M. Downam* haue learned out of *Bellarmine* himselfe, if he would haue taken the paines to haue read him ouer, or at least so much as he meant to impugne, as it was good reasō he should haue done, before he had gone about to answere him. Neither shall I need to spend any more tyme in this matter since his chiefest authorities are out of these two Councels. For what he meaneth by that which happened *tempore Mauritij*, I cannot yet coniecture; for it were too absurd for him to defend *Iohn* of *Cōstantinople* against *S. Gregory*, as likewise the Bishops of *Rauenna*, whose arrogancy & ambition is condēned & cōtemned also by the whole world. But it is no meruaile though in so bad a cause *M. Downam* can find no better Patrons.

Downam seemeth not to haue read so much of Bellarm. as he impugneth.

5. Con-

5. *Concerning the comming of Antichriſt with the temporall ſword*, which is the ſecond degree, *M. Downam* goeth about to iuggle with vs after a ſtrange manner. For wheras *Bellarmine* in the confutation of *Luther*, confuteth three groundes, which *Luther* built his opinion vpon. I. the depoſition of the Emperour *Henry* the 4. II. the hauing temporall dominion. III: the making of warre; by ſhewing that all theſe three Actes had bene exerciſed, by the Pope before this tyme, putting particuler examples of euery one; *M. Downam* very cunningly, as he thought, but indeed very ſeelily, as it will appeare now that he is taken with the manner, anſwereth, that true it is, *that the Popes had a temporall dominion before, but not generall*; and ſo with granting one part, he thinkes he may ſafely deny the other, without euer troubling himſelfe to examine *Bellarmines* inſtance any further. But we muſt put him in mind, that when *Gregory* the ſecond depriued *Leo* the Emperour, of the Kingdome of *Italy*, he did not only ſhew himſelfe to haue right to the patrimony of *S. Peter*, which could only haue warranted him to haue kept that from the Emperour; but likewiſe to haue a generall authority to depriue Princes of their owne dominions in ſome caſes, and for ſome cauſes, which he could not do but by a generall power, though we will not much ſtand with *M. Downam* about the name of *Temporall power*; for that we rather thinke it to be ſpirituall, & therfore cānot be exerciſed by the Pope, but for the ſpirituall good of Chriſts Church; as *M. Downam* may ſee largely explicated by *Bellarm.* in his 5. booke; where alſo he ſhall find diuers other examples to this purpoſe; to which it will not be inough for him to oppoſe his hereticall author *Auentinus*; for we will at any tyme take *M. Downams* owne word, ſo ſoone as any other of his mind, except they bring better profs then he doth. And this is all, which *M. Downam* hath to ſaie againſt *Bellarmine*; wherfore he concludeth in theſe wordes: *And thus haue I anſwered whatſoeuer is in his 3. Chapter. pertinent to the matter in hand, omitting (as my manner is) his other wranglings, as being altogeather either impertinēt, or merely perſonal.* Where I wil only craue the Iudicious Reader, to looke ouer *Bellarmines* whole diſcourſe, and if he findeth nothing in it, but which directly impugneth the opinions and not the perſons, which he

XXII.

Downams ſeely iuggling.

The pope hath power to depoſe Princes for the ſpirituall good of Chriſts Church.

Of Auentine See part 2. Chap. 3. n. 6.

he alleageth, and withall that he doth it so inuincibly, that there can be no euasion, as I verily perswade my selfe any indifferēt man will easily see: then let him know, that whatsoeuer *M. Downam* hath omitted, was because he could by no meanes make so much as any shew of answering it, as he hath gone about to doe in this, which we haue examined: and withall let him know also, that this is *M. Downams* manner as he himselfe affirmeth, and make accompt of the Man accordingly.

Downams māner to omit that which he cannot answere.

THE

THE FOVRTH CHAPTER.

In which is explicated the first demonstration, that Antichrist is not yet come.

WHEREFORE the true opinion is (saith *Bellarmine*) that Antichrist hath neither begun to raigne, nor is yet come; but is to come, and to raigne about the end of the world; which how farre it is off, can by no meanes be knowne. This opinion, which ouerthroweth all the former and cleerely sheweth that the Bishops of *Rome* are not *Antichrists*, is demonstrated by six reasons. I.

For we must know, that the Holy Ghost in the Scripture hath giuen vs six certaine signes of Antichrists cōming, two going before Antichrist himselfe, to wit the preaching of the ghospell in the whole world, and the desolation of the Roman Empire; two accompanying him, to wit the preaching of *Henoch* and *Helias*, and a most huge & manyfest persecution, so that publique Holies shall wholie cease: two following, to wit the destruction of Antichrist after three yeares, and a halfe, and the end of the world: none of which wee see yet extant. II.

Wherefore the first demonstration is taken from the first signe going before Antichrist. The Scriptures do testifie, that the Ghospell is to be preached in the whole world before the last persecution commeth, which shalbe raised by Antichrist, *Matth.* 24. *This Ghospell of the kingdome shalbe preached* in III.

« *in the whole world, in testimony to all nations.* And that this shalbe « before Antichrists comming, might be proued by that reaso, « because in Antichrists tyme the crueltie of that last persecutiō « shall hinder all publique exercise of True Religion.

IV. « But because the aduersaries admit not this reason and « it is no tyme now to deduce it out of her principles: let vs « proue the same out of the Fathers testimonies. Wherefore « *S. Hilarie cap.* 25. *in Matth.* expounding those wordes: *This* « *Ghospell of the Kingdome shalbe preached in the whole world, and then the* « *consumation shall come*, plainelie teacheth, that Antichrist shall « not come, whom he calleth the *Abhomination of Desolation*, vn- « les the preaching of the Ghospell in the whole world goeth « before.

V. « The same is expreslie taught by *S. Cyrill catechesi* 15. « *Theodoret in* 2. *Thess.* 2. *S. Damascen lib.* 4. *cap.* 28. and others. « And besides the same is gathered out of the text, for it is said, « that the Ghospell is to be preached before that greatest and « last tribulation commeth, what manner of one, neither hath « ben before, nor shalbe after. By which tribulation that An- « tichrists persecution is signified, the Fathers teach, and chie- « flie *S. Augustine lib.* 20. *de ciuitate Dei, cap.* 8. *&* 19. And that « the Ghospell was not preached in the whole world at that « time, when the new *Samosatenes* saie, that Antichrist came, « that is, about the yeare of our Lord 200. or 300. is manifest « by *Origen*, who *Homil.* 28. *in Matth.* affirmeth, that in his tyme « the Ghospell was not yet preached euerie where. Likewise « by *Ruffinus*, who *lib.* 3. *hist. cap.* 9. testifieth, that in the tyme « of *Constantyne* the Emperour, that is, after the yeare of our « Lord 300. the Ghospell was preached to the more remote « *Indians*: whereas, before that tyme, they had neuer heard any « thing of Christ. Finally by *S. Augustine* who in his 80. *epist.* « saith, that he had found by most certaine experience, that in « his tyme, there were manie nations which had heard no- « thing of Christ.

VI. « And that the preaching of the Ghospell was not accōpli- « shed about the yeare 600. or 700. at which tymes the *Cen-* « *turiators, Chytræus, Luther*, and *Bullinger* put the comming of An- « tichrist, is manifest by the conuersion of the *Vandals, Polonians,* « *Morauians*, and the like, who as it is well knowne heard not

the

the preaching of the Ghoſpel, vntill after the yeare of Chriſt 800. as alſo the *Centuriators* confeſſe *centur. 9. cap. 2. col. 15. & 18. & cent. 10. cap. 2. col. 18. & 19.* In like manner that the preaching was not cõplete in the tyme of *S. Bernard*, at which tyme *VVolfgangus Muſculus* putteth the comming of Antichriſt is manifeſt out of *S. Bernard* himſelfe *lib. 3. de conſider.* where he affirmeth, that yet in his time, there were Nations which had not heard the Ghoſpell.

VII. Finally, that alſo in our tyme, the Ghoſpell is not preached in the whole world, experience teacheth, for ther are moſt vaſt Regiõs found in the Eaſt & Weſt, in which there is no memory of the Ghoſpell. Neither can it be ſaid, that the Faith was there, but was afterward extinguiſhed. For at leaſtwiſe, ſome ſignes would remaine either there, or in the writings of the Ancients. Beſides we know, that where all the Apoſtles preached, the places were knowne to many if not to all; but the new world is now found, & was not knowne from the Apoſtles tyme, but a little before our age.

VIII. Againſt this Demonſtration, there can only one obiection be made, to wit, becauſe perhapps the Scriptures, which ſay that the Ghoſpell is to be preached in the whole world ſpeake not ſimple of the whole world, but by the figure of intellection, take the whole for a part, as *Luc. 2.* where it is ſaid, *There went out an Edict from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the world ſhould be deſcribed*, otherwiſe, that will be falſe, which *S. Paul* ſaith *Rom. 10.* euen then in his tyme, *That the ſound of the Apoſtles was gone forth into all the earth*, and that which he ſaith *Coloſ. 1. The Ghoſpell which is come to yow, as it is in the whole world, fructifying and increaſing.* And after, *VVhich is preached to all creatures, which are vnder Heauen.*

IX. I anſwere without doubt, not by any figure, but properly and ſimply in the whole world, that is, in euery Natiõ the Ghoſpell muſt be preached, and Churches inſtituted. For firſt ſo expreſly teacheth *S. Auguſtine ep. 80. ad Heſychium*, and the other Fathers alleadged thinke the ſame, and beſides *Origen* and *S. Hierome*, and others *in cap. 24. Matth.*

X. It may alſo be proued by three reaſons. Firſt, Chriſt ſaith that the preaching in the whole world is a ſigne of the con-

« ſumation of the world, for ſo he addeth forthwith; *and then*
« *the conſummatiõ ſhall come*; but if not properly, but by *synecdoche*
« the Gnoſpell were to be preached in the whole world, that
« ſigne were nothing worth; for in that manner the Ghoſpell
« was preached in the whole world the firſt 20. yeares. Se-
« condly as *S. Auguſtine* reaſoneth, properly all Nations are pro-
« miſed to Chriſt *Pſal.* 71. *All Nations ſhall ſerue thee*. And Chriſt
« died generally for all, and therfore *Apoc. cap.* 7. the elected are
« deſcribed *out of all Nations, and people, and tribes, and languages*.
« VVherfore the preaching alſo muſt properly be generall. Fi-
« nally *Matth.* 24. it is ſaid, that the Ghoſpell is to be preached
« in the whole world in teſtimony to all Nations, that is, leaſt
« any Nation in the daie of Iudgement might excuſe their
« infidelity, by the pretext of ignorance. Wherfore before
« the generall iudgement the generall preaching muſt be.

XI. « To thoſe places of *S. Paul*, *S. Auguſtine* anſwereth *epiſt.*
« 80. and ſaith, that *S. Paul*, when he ſaith *Rom* 10. *their ſound is*
« *gone out into all the earth, tooke the tyme paſt for the tyme to come, as*
« Dauid *had donne, whoſe wordes thoſe are*. And when he ſaith
« *Colloſſ.* 1. that *the Ghoſpell is in the whole world*, he would not ſay
« that it is actuallie, but vertuallie, to wit, becauſe the ſeed of
« Gods word had bene caſt into the world by the Apoſtles,
« which fructifying and increaſing by little and little, was
« to repleniſh the whole world: as one that had put fire to di-
« uers parts of a Citty, might trulie be ſaid to haue ſet all the
« Cittie on fire, becauſe he had applied the fire, which increa-
« ſing by little and little, was to conſume the whole Cittie.
« And this verie ſame ſignifieth the Apoſtle when he ſaith, *in*
« *the whole world*, it is *fructifying and increaſing*; for it had not taken
« poſſeſſion wholie of the whole world, ſeeing it was yet
« more and more ſpread afterward abroad, and yet in a cer-
« taine manner it had taken poſſeſſion, that is vertuallie, and
« not actuallie.

XII. « We might alſo anſwere with *S. Hierome*, *in Matth.* 20. &
« *S. Thomas in Rom.* 10. that the Ghoſpell came to all in two mã-
« ners: one way by fame, another way by peculiar preachers,
« and foundation of Churches; and that in the firſt man-
« ner, the Ghoſpell came to all Nations of the whole
« world then knowne in the tyme of the Apoſtles; and that

S.

S. Paul ſpeaketh of this: in which ſort alſo *S. Chryſoſtome in* „
Matth. 24. is to be vnderſtood. But in the ſecond manner, „
that it came not then, but is to come in the tyme appointed, „
and that our Lord *Matth.* 24. *Luc. vlt. & Act.* 1. ſpeaketh of „
this. „

Adde laſtlie, that it is not abſurd, if we graunt, that „
our Lord ſpake properlie, and the Apoſtle figuratiuelie. For „
the reaſons which compell vs to take our Lordes wordes in „
a proper ſignification, haue not the ſame force, if they be „
applied to the wordes of *S. Paul*, eſpeciallie ſeeing our Lord „
ſpake of a thing to come, and *S. Paul* of a thing paſt. „

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. IT pleaſeth *M. Downam* to be a little merrie about theſe 6. Demonſtrations, calling them *ſix ſlender coniectures*, and thinking *Bellarmyne troubled with melancholie*, for deeming otherwiſe. But I will leaue it to the Readers iudgment, if it be not more likely, that he is loaden with folly. Afterward he ieſteth at *Bellarmine*, for making Antichriſts *death, & the end of the world, which shalbe after his death, to be two ſignes of his comming*. As though all this were not to fall out within 3. or 4. yeares after his comming: and conſequentlie did not plainelie demonſtrate, that he came not a 1000. yeares ſince, which is that, which *Bellarmine* goeth about to prooue, and ſo might verie well vſe theſe ſignes to demonſtrate his not comming ſo long agoe.

2. But comming to anſwere the firſt demonſtration, it is wonderfull to ſee how many wordes he ſpendeth in vaine, and how few to the purpoſe. For he being to anſwere *Bellarmines* prooſes, which I haue alleadged, he ſcarſe euer toucheth any of them, but maketh a long diſcourſe altogeather friuolous, about the expoſitiō of that whole place *Matth.* 24. Wherefore I ſhalbe inforced to gather vp heere and there ſome ſcattered denialls, and ſo replie to this his broken and confuſed anſwere.

3. And firſt to the Fathers which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth IV. V. as his chiefeſt prooſe, I find only theſe wordes of his: *Or to*

what end (saith he) should I spend my tyme in answering the Testimonies of the Fathers, who supposed that the Ghospell should be preached in all the world, before the comming of Antichrist, seing according to the meaning of our Sauiour Christ, it was to be preached in all the world, before the destruction of Ierusalem? And is not this a wise answere, thinke you, to accuse the Fathers to be against Christ, because their doctrine is contrary to *M. Downams*? But I take it, few will beleiue him vpon his bare word against *Bellarmine* alone, & much lesse hauing so manie ancient Fathers ioyned with him.

Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

V. 4. *Bellarmines* other proofe was out of the text, because by that great tribulation, before which it is said, that the Ghospell shalbe preached in the whole world; the Fathers, and in particuler *S. Augustine* vnderstandeth Antichrists persecution. But *M. Downam* neuer mentioning *S. Augustine*, or other Father, flatlie denieth their doctrine in this point, as he had done in the former, & therefore indeed, neuer goeth about to answere the argument, but to denie the conclusiō, whatsoeuer the proofes be.

III. 5. Yea, that which is worse, because he would seeme to say something, he beareth the Reader in hand, that *Bellarmine* had bene so simple, as to prooue his conclusion only out of those wordes *Matth. 24. This ghospell of the Kingdome shalbe preached in the whole world in testimony to all Nations*. And then he answereth verie grauelie. *But our Sauiour Christ doth not saie, that the Ghospell shalbe preached throughout the world, before the comming of Antichrist, but before the end*. And is not this to get himselfe out of his Aduersaries reach, and then to shew great valour in playing his prize by himselfe alone, and beating the ayre?

Downam omitteth Bellarmines proofes & answereth his owne.

6. Another tricke of *M. Downās* is, to answere an argumēt which *Bellarmine* thought better for breuities sake to leaue vnproued: that is, that in Antichrists tyme, the cruelty of the last persecution shall hinder all publike exercise of true Religion. To which *M. Downam* answereth: *That it is not necessary, that the Ghospell should be preached generally throughout the world at one tyme: for it might suffice, that in one age it were preached to one Nation, and in another age to another people. and so in Antichrists tyme it might be preached to some Nations, where it had not bene formerly*

IIII.

merly preached; & therſore might be preached to all Nations before the deſtruction of Antichriſt, though it were not before his comming. But Bellarmine neuer affirmed, that the Ghoſpell ſhould be generallie preached throughout the world at one tyme: but M. Downam dreameth it. And if he would haue ſaid any thing to the purpoſe, he ſhould haue tould vs, how the Ghoſpell can be preached to any Nation, when the perſecution is ſo great and generall, that all publike exercile of true Religion doth ceale in all places, throughout the whole world. And this is all, that he bringeth in anſwere to the arguments. Wherfore only there remayneth, that we ſee, whether he proueth his owne expoſition in thoſe two pointes, in which he is contrary to Bellarmine and the Fathers, any better.

7. For firſt, he will needes haue *the conſummatiō* of which our Sauiour ſpeaketh, *to be the deſtruction of Ieruſalem*, and not *the end of the world*, but yet neuer anſwereth to any of thoſe argumēts, which *Bell.* hath in his anſwere to the obiection; three of the which, namelie the authoritie of the Fathers, and the two latter reaſons are ſo manifeſt, that *M. Downam* delt very politikely in diſſembling them, ſince he could not anſwere them. And to proue his owne expoſitiō, he bringeth a conceited inuentiō of his owne, to witt, that our Bleſſed Sauiour *would comfort his Diſciples by telling them, that the ſucceſſe of their Miniſtry ſhould be ſuch, that before the deſolation of* Hieruſalem, *the Ghoſpell ſhould be preached throughout the world, for a teſtimony to all Nations verſ.* 14. *And therfore that they ſhould not feare, leaſt togeather with* Hieruſalem *his Church ſhould be ouerthrowne: for before the deſtruction of* Hieruſalem *he would by their preaching to all Nations both Iewes and Gentiles, plant his Church in many nations of the world. And for aſmuch as the Temple and Citty of* Hieruſalem *were types and figures of the Church of Chriſt which were to be abolished when the Church of Chriſt ſhould be eſtablished; therefore he addeth, that vpon the planting of the Church by their Miniſtry, ſhould the end and deſtruction of* Hieruſalem *come.* *Matth. 24.*

IX. X. Downam diſſembleth the difficultie.

8. But this is not only doubtfull, ſince o I *M. Downams* authority is not ſufficient to make it certaine, but alſo altogeather childiſh and fooliſh. For how could the Apoſtles feare, leaſt togeather with *Ieruſalem* Chriſts Church ſhould be ouerthrowne? ſince as he himſelfe ſaith, the Temple and Citty

Downam expoundeth ſcripture childiſhly.

Cittie of *Hierusalem* were Types and figures of the Church of Christ, which were to be abolished when the Church of Christ should be established, and consequently the Apostles should neuer haue greater hope, that Christes Church should be established, then when they should see the Temple and Citty of *Hierusalem*, and in them the Iewes Synagogue abolished. And were not he a wise man, thinke you, that would go about to comfort Catholikes, by telling them, that they must not be afrayd, though they see heretikes abolished, who are their chiefest aduersaries? since that the preuailing of Catholikes consisteth chiefly in the abolishing of heretikes? But by this we may see to what absurdities, such men as *M. Downam* are brought, when leauing the exposition of the Fathers, they will follow their owne priuate new-fangled inuentions.

The propheſies cõcerning the destruction of Hierusalẽ & the end of the world intermingled.

9. After this againe he saith, *that wee may not thinke, that our Sauiour Christ would intermingle the Propheſies, concerning the destruction of Ierusalem, and the end of the world, thereby to nourish the error of his Disciples, who imagined that the end of Ierusalẽ should not be before the end of the world, as appeareth by their question.* But on the other side the Fathers tell vs, that we must thinke, that our Sauiour did intermingle these Propheſies of purpose, to let them be in continuall expectation of the end of the world, and that when they should see the subuersiõ of the Temple, they should not be secure, that the end of the world was not also very neere. And this experience also teacheth, since as *Bellarmine* in part sheweth in the former Chapter and first opinion, the holy Fathers expected our Sauiours comming euery one in his tyme. And this is that which they thinke to appeare both by the Apostles question, and our Sauiours answere; for they seemed to be doubtfull of it, and our Sauiour leaueth them as doubtfull in this point.

10. Thirdly, *M. Downam* goeth about to confirme his opinion by those wordes of our Sauiour: *Verilie I say vnto you, this generation shall not passe, vntill all those thinges* (pointing as it seemeth (saith M. Downam) *towards Ierusalem, as he sate on the Mount Oliuet*) *be fulfilled.* But by this exposition of his, he intermingleth these Propheſies more then any Catholike doth, for he maketh the last wordes to appertayne to the former part

part only: & to haue no coherence with that, which goeth immediatly before, which is as great a cõfuſiõ as may be. And becauſe he ſaw it himſelfe, he imagineth our B. Sauiour vpon the ſuddaine only, while he pronounceth theſe wordes, to point towards *Ieruſalem*. But we are not bound to beleiue all his imaginations, nor reports neither, ſince he is no Euangeliſt, and therefore we alſo thinke that he tooke ſomewhat to much vpon him, when he preſumed to change one only letter in this narration, becauſe it fauoured his imagination more then that which he ſhould haue left, if he had bene a faithfull tranſlator, which indeed belonged vnto him. For our Sauiour ſaith not (*all thoſe thinges*) as though they were thinges a farre of, but (*theſe thinges*) of which he had ſpoken. *S. Matthew*, *Omnia hæc*, *S. Marke*, *Omnia iſta*, & *S. Luke*, only *Omnia*. So that mee thinkes ſince all three Euangeliſts, were ſo diligent to repeate the word (*All*) he ſhould not haue bene ſo bould as to change it into (*ſome*) by applying it to part only of our Sauiours ſpeach, and to the further part alſo. But we thinke our ſelues more bound to beleiue the Euangeliſts, & the holy Fathers expounding them, then theſe farre fetched deuiſes of *M. Downam*; and ſo we doubt not, that before this generation, that is, this corruptible world paſſeth, and both heauen and earth be renewed, all thoſe thinges ſhall come to paſſe. And this our Sauiour ſignifyeth, when hee immediately addeth, that *Heauen and earth ſhall paſſe*, and not continue alway, as now we ſee them: *but his wordes ſhall not paſſe* vnfulfilled.

Downams fond imagination.

Downam corrupteth the text of Scripture.

11. Neither can *M. Downam* help himſelfe, by telling vs that *Luc.* 21. *The queſtion concerning* Ieruſalem *is propounded alone*: for well we may graunt him, that *S. Luke* onlie mentioneth that queſtion, but wee ſhall ſtill thinke our ſelues bound to beleiue *S. Matthew*, telling the ſame ſtory, and rehearſing the other queſtions alſo, which *S. Luke* anſwereth aſwell as he, though he omitteth the queſtions for breuities ſake. And this very circumſtance of preaching the Ghoſpell in the whole world, was not omitted by *S. Luke*, but rather very particulerly ſignified in thoſe wordes, *donec impleantur tempora Nationũ*, while the tymes of Nations be fulfilled, that is, till all Nations haue had the ghoſpell preached vnto them, as *S. Marke*, and

Luc. 21.

and *S. Matthew* do explicate, & *S. Paul* repeateth the very same *Rom.* 11. *Cæcitas ex parte contigit in Israel*, blindenes hath happned in part in Israel, which *S. Luke* said, *Ierusalem calcabitur à gentibus*. But how long? *S. Paul*, *donec plenitudo Gentium intraret*, vntill the fulnes of Nations should enter, which is the very same, that *S. Luke* saith in the words following already rehearsed.

Downam maketh much accompt of one Father if he fauour his fancies.

12. Finally *M. Downam* is content to cite *S. Chrysostome* for his opinion, for it is the propertie of such men to esteme more the authority of one Father, which fauoureth their conceipts, then of neuer so many, if they bee against their fancies: & so now we see this man, who would not vouchsafe the Fathers, which *Bellarmine* alleaged, so much as a word, is yet content to bring out *S. Chrysostome* for himselfe, and he seemeth to meane the place which a little after he citeth againe *Homil. in Matth.* 24. And though we might oppose many against one, and so thinke our selues before *M. Downam*: yet we would haue him know, that our doctrine standeth not so much vpon denials, as his doth; but rather vpon the affirmative; and so though we affirme and proue, that the Ghospell is to be preached in the whole world, before the end of the world; yet we deny not, but that it was in some sort so preached before the destruction of *Ierusalem*, & thinke that our Sauiour with his diuine wisdome comprehended both in the same wordes: for the one being a figure of the other, the same wordes may very well be vnderstood of both, as we see they were by the Fathers, though chiefly & for the most part of the proper & distinct preaching in the whole world as the wordes properly taken doe import. And wee thinke *S. Augustins* rule very true that when the wordes may be so taken, without manifest absurditie, that is the true sense, & most certaine: for otherwise we should haue no certainty in vnderstanding Scripture at all; and in this case, admitting both senses, may fitly be vsed that vulgar saying of the *Mathematicians*: *Quod fit in circulo, fit in cælo*: *that which agreeeth in a circle, may* (due proportion obserued) *be applied to the Heauens*, which are like to a circle in being round, as likewise the end of the world is to the destruction of *Hierusalem* in many thinges. And thus much for the first difference about the

Catholike doctrine standeth not so much vpō denialls, as that of Protestāts.

Whē the proper expositiō is to bee preferred.

lib. 3. de doct. christia. cap 7.

word

word *Conſummation*.

13. But now there remaineth another about the great Tribulation, which *M. Downam* likewiſe denieth to be any other, then that of the Iewes, and would faine father this expoſition vpon *S. Chryſoſtome* alſo; which as in the other wee may graunt to be probable; but onlie *M. Downam* will deny that of *S. Auguſtine* and other Fathers; for none of thē are ſo forward as he in denying, becauſe they had not his ſpirit of contradiction: and indeed the matter is ſo plaine, that he had need to haue an hard forhead that ſhould deny it. *S. Marke cap.* 13. ſaith: *In illis diebus poſt tribulationem illam ſol contenebrabitur &c. In thoſe dayes after that Tribulation, the ſunne ſhal be darkened &c.* which happened not after the deſtruction of *Hieruſalem*, except *M. Downam* will run to that ſhift to ſay, that it happened after, though it were long firſt: which though it were very ridiculous and abſurd in it ſelf, yet *S. Matth.* alſo wholy excludeth it, with adding *ſtatim, forthwith: Statim autem poſt tribulationem dierum illorum ſol obſcurabitur &c. And ſtraight after the tribulation of thoſe daies, the ſun ſhalbe darkened &c.* And heere I leaue *M. Downam* in this ſtrait, hoping he will learne to attribute more to the Fathers expoſitiōs hereafter, ſeeing them ſo conformable to Gods word. By the great Tribulation *Matth.* 24. is meant the perſecution of Antichriſt a little before the end of the world.

14. And to conclude this Chapter, let vs ſee, what *M. Downam* hath replyed againſt *Bellarmines* anſwere to the obiection, where we muſt note, that he endeauoreth onlie to impugne the firſt anſwere, and to the other two hath not ſo much as a word to ſaie; for that indeed whatſoeuer he had ſaid againſt them, had byn alſo againſt himſelfe, as likewiſe againſt all experience, and the proofes with which *Bellarmine* proued his *Minor*, to wit, that at none of thoſe tymes, which the heretikes aſſigne for Antichriſts cōming, and much leſſe in the Apoſtles tymes, the Ghoſpell had bēn preached properlie in the whole world, and therefore whē the Apoſtle ſaith, that it had bene preached in the whole world, he were either to be vnderſtood figuratiuelie, or by fame, which are *Bellarmines* two latter ſolutions, not miſliked by *M. Downam*; though if his diſtinction *of preaching, but not receauing the Ghoſpell in the whole world*, were to the purpoſe, he ſhould graunt the preaching to haue bene properlie XI. XII. XIII. V. VI. VII.

lie in the whole world, and so contradict himselfe, and fall into the absurdities before mentioned, or els be inforced to yield to *Bellarmines* first solution also, which he so eagerlie impugneth, that *S. Paul Rom.* 10. tooke the tyme past for the tyme to come, which he calleth a cauillation, thinking that he may be bould with *Bellarmine*: but yet he might haue borne a little more respect to *S. Augustine*, whose solution it is, especiallie hauing so little to say against it. You shall heare his owne wordes. *But say I, the Apostle proueth, that the Iewes had heard the Ghospell, because the sound of the preachers thereof, was gone through all the earth, and therefore they from whome the Ghospell proceeded to other Nations, cannot be ignorant therof.* And now let any man iudge, if it had not bene more wisdome & modestie for *M. Downam*, to haue alleadged *S. Chrysostome* whose exposition this is, as *Bellarmine* did *S. Augustine*, then to come out with an (*I say*) only affirming but prouing nothing, neither by authoritie or reason, as likewise to haue admitted both these expositions for probable, as *Bellarmine* doth, and not set one Father against another, who agree well inough, and are not so addicted to their owne priuate iudgdment, that they condemne any other probable opinion, though they thinke their owne more probable. Now whether of these two opinions is more probable, I leaue to others to examine, since it were from my purpose to discusse that question. But if *M. Downam* will needes contend, I remit him to *Cardinall Toletes* exposition vpon this place, where he explicateth, and defendeth *S. Augustines* opinion, against whome if he hath any thing to say in this point, he shall not goe vnanswered. But I would wish him rather to prooue, then to scoffe, especiallie at *S. Augustine* & other Fathers; otherwise to any discret Reader he will seeme too ridiculous, though he vseth all his Sophistrie, as he doth heere, by telling vs, that *the Ghospell could not bring forth fruite, vnlesse it were actuallie*; and to shew his great learning noteth the same sense in the margent both in latin and greeke. But he must know, that as it is necessary, that the Ghospell should be actuallie in some place of the world, before it bringeth forth fruit; so is it sufficient, that it be vertuallie in the whole world: & the verie increasing & extending

Rom. 10.

Downams immodesty.

How the Ghospell was in the whole world in the Apostles tyme.

tending it ſelfe, is one manner of bringing forth fruite, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh; which could not be, if already the Ghoſpell had bene actuallie in the whole world, and therefore it is to be vnderſtood only vertuallie, in reſpect of the whole world, as is well declared by the example of a Citty ſet on fire in ſome places, which may trulie be ſaid to be all on fire vertuallie, though actuallie onlie ſome parts of it be ſoe. And thus wee haue ſeene what *M. Downam* hath ben able to ſaie for himſelfe, not hauing omitted anie ſhift of his, except he would haue vs repeate the ſame thing as often as he doth, as now at the verie end, citing afreſh thoſe wordes of *S. Paul*, that the *Ghoſpell is preached among all creatures, that are vnder Heauen*; which *Bellarmine* did put in obiection, and anſwered three wayes, as wee haue ſeene.

THE FIFTH CHAPTER.

Conteyning the second Demonstration.

I. THE second demonstration (saith *Bellarmine*) is taken from the other signe going before Antichrists tymes, which shalbe an vtter desolation, and ouerthrow of the *Roman* Empire; for we must know that the *Roman* Empire is at length to be deuided into ten Kinges; of which none shalbe, or be called the King of the Romans, although all of them shall occupie some Prouinces of the *Roman* Empire, as now the King of *France*, the King of *Spaine*, the Queene of *Englād*, & perhaps some others doe hould some partes of the *Roman* Empire, and yet are no *Roman* Kinges, or Emperours, and so long as this is not effected, Antichrist cannot come.

II. This *Irenæus* proueth *l.* 5. out of *Dan. cap.* 2. *&* 7. & out of the *Apocal. cap.* 17. for in the 2. *chap.* of *Dan* is described the succession of the chiefest Kingdomes, vnto the worldes end, by a certayne *Statua* or Image, whose golden head signifieth the first Kingdome, that is of the *Assyrians*; the siluer breast is the second Kingdome, that is of the *Persians*: the brasen belly the third kingdome, that is of the *Grecians*. the Iron legges the fourth kingdome, that is of the *Romans* which for the longest space, was twofould, as the legges are two, and longest. Furthermore out of the two legges there grew ten toes, and in them the whole *Statua* ended; for that the *Roman* Empire was at length to be deuided into

ten

ten Kinges, none of which ſhalbe the King of the *Romans*, as none of the toes is a legge. Likewiſe in the 7. Chapter, the Prophet *Daniel* moſt clearly deſigneth the ſame 4. Kingdoms by 4. beaſtes, and addeth that out of the laſt Beaſt, there ſhall ariſe ten hornes which ſignifyeth the ten laſt Kings which ſhall ariſe out of the *Roman* Empire, but ſhall not be *Roman* Emperours, as the hornes ariſe out of the Beaſt, but are not the Beaſt it ſelfe.

III. Finally *S. Iohn cap.* 17. *Apoc.* deſcribeth a beaſt with 7. heades & ten hornes, vpon which a certain woman did ſit; and he explicateth the woman to be the geat Citty, which is ſituated vpon 7. hills, that is *Rome*, & that the ſeauen heads are thoſe 7. hills, and likewiſe 7. Kinges; by which number are vnderſtood all the *Roman* Emperours. The ten hornes he ſaith to be ten Kinges, who ſhall raigne togeather at one tyme. And leaſt we ſhould thinke, that theſe ſhalbe Roman Kinges, he addeth that theſe Kinges ſhall hate the harlot and make her deſolate, becauſe they ſhall ſo deuide the *Roman* Empire amongſt themſelues, that they ſhall vtterly deſtroy it.

IV. Beſides the ſame is proued out of *S. Paul.* 2. *Theſſ.* 2. where he ſaith: *And now what deteyneth, you know, that he may be reuealed in his tyme only, that he which now houldeth do hould, vntill he be taken out of the way, and then ſhall that wicked one be reuealed.* &c. where *S. Paul* not daring to write plainly of the ouerthrow of the *Roman* Empire, which notwithſtanding he had by word of mouth plainly explicated vnto them, ſpeaketh in that ſort; and the ſenſe is: Yow know what hindereth the comming of Antichriſt: for I haue tould you, that the *Roman* Empire hindereth, for that their ſinns are not yet at their ful height; and Antichriſt ſhall not come before, who ſhall take away this Empire for their ſinnes. Therfore let him that now holdeth the *Roman* Empire, hould it ſtil: that is, let him raigne till he be taken out of the way, that is, aboliſhed; and then that wicked one ſhalbe reuealed. So doe the Greeke & Latin Fathers expound it, *S. Cyril Catecheſi* 15. diſputing of this place. *The foreſaid Antichriſt* (ſaith he) *ſhall come when the tymes of the Roman Empire are expired.* S. Chryſoſtome vpon this place: *VVhen the* Roman *Empire ſhalbe taken away, then ſhall Antichriſt come*, *Theophilactus*, and *Oecumenius* write to the ſame effect

« fect.

V. « Of the Latines, *Tertullianus Apologetico cap.* 32. saith, that « *Christians doe praie for the continuance of the Roman Empire, because* « *they know, that when that Empire is ouerthrowne, there shall a great ca-* « *lamity fall vpon the world.* And *Lactantius l.* 7. *cap.* 15. explica- « ting those thinges which shall goe before Antichrist, and « the end of the world, saith: *the Roman name, by which the world is* « *now gouerned, my mind is afraid to speake it, but I will speake it, because it* « III *shalbe, shalbe take from the earth, & the Empire shall returne into Asia, &* « *the East shall rule again, and the west serue. S. Ambrose* vpō. 2. *Thess.* 2. « saith, *that after the defection, and abolition of the Roma Kingdome,* « *Antichrist shall come.*

VI. « *S. Hierome quæst.* 11. *ad Algasiam* expounding the same « place of *S. paul* saith: *Vnles there come a reuolt first that all Nations* « *which are subiect to the Roman Empire, reuolt from them; and vnles* « *the Roman Empire be first desolate, and Antichrist goe before, Christ* « *will not come, onlie that the Roman Empire which now houldeth all Na-* « *tions, passe and be taken away, and then Antichrist shall come.* Finally « *S. Augustine lib.* 20. *de ciuitate dei, cap.* 19. expounded the same « place thus: *Only let him which now reigneth, rayne till he be take out* « *of the way, and then that wicked one shalbe reuealed, by whome no man* « *doubteth, but that Antichrist is signified.*

VII. « Now that this signe was not fulfilled at those tymes, in « which the *Anti trinitarians* of *Transiluania* say, that Antichrist « came, that is about the yeare of our Lord 200. it is manifest, « because then most of all did the *Roman* Empire flourish, and « so continued long after.

VIII. « Likewise that it hath not bin fulfilled at any tyme hi- « therto, it is plaine, because as yet there remayneth the succes- « sion and name of the *Roman* Emperours, and by the won- « derfull prouidence of God, when the Empire failed in the « West, which was one of the leggs of *Daniels Statua*, the empire « of the East remayned sound, which was the other legge. « But because the Empire of the *East* was to be destroyed by « *Turkes*, as we see now it is, God erected againe the former « legge in the *VVest*, that is, the *VVest Empire*, by *Charles* the « Great, which Empire lasteth still.

« Neither is it any obstacle, that *Rome* it selfe, according IX. « to *S. Iohns* prophesy, is after a certaine manner fallen, & hath

lost

loſt the Empire, for the *Roman* Empire may well ſtand without the Cittie of *Rome*, and he be called the *Roman* Emperour who hath not *Rome*, ſo that he ſucceedeth another *Roman* Emperour in the ſame dignity & power, whether he hath more or fewer Prouinces vnder his empire: otherwiſe neither *Valens*, nor *Arcadius*, nor *Theodoſius* the yonger, nor other their ſucceſſours to *Iuſtinian*, none of which had *Rome*, could haue byn called *Roman* Emperours. Neither *Charles* the Great, and his ſucceſſors, who likewiſe enioyed not the Cittie of *Rome* had euer bene Emperours, which is manifeſtly falſe, for two reaſons.

X. Firſt, becauſe for this only reſpect the Emperour which now is, hath the precedence before all Chriſtian Kinges, though otherwiſe greater, and more potent then he. Secōdly becauſe it is well knowne, that *Charles* was created Emperour, by the cōſent of the *Romans*, as *Paulus Diaconus* teſtifieth *lib.* 23. *rerum Romanarum*, and was ſaluted Emperour from the Greeke Emperour himſelf, by his Ambaſſadours, as *Ado* teſtifyeth in his Cronicle of the yeare 810. & honoured as Emperour with preſents by the *Perſians* and *Arabians*, witnes *Otho Friſingenſis lib.* 5. *cap.* 31. Finally the *Lutherans* boaſt, that they haue three Princes Electors of the *Roman* Emperour: therfore they cannot deny, but that the *Roman* Empire laſteth ſtill.

XI. Wherfore rightly *Oroſius lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. comparing the *Babylonicall* Empyre with the *Roman*, ſayth; that God hath dealt far more mildly with the *Romans*, then with the *Babylonians*, for after 1164. yeares that *Babylon* was builded, in one day *Babylon* the head of that Empyre was takē, the Emperour ſlayne, and the Empire ouerthrowne and deſtroyed. But after as many yeares, that is 1164. that *Rome* had bene, *Rome* was taken by the *Gothes*, but the Emperour *Honorius*, who then gouerned, and the *Roman* Empire being in ſafety.

XII. Hence appeareth how our Aduerſaries are deceaued: for they thought that the declination of the *Roman* Empire was ſufficient for Antichriſts comming: but *S. Paul*, *S. Iohn*, & *Daniel*, and the Fathers *S. Irenaus*, *S. Cyril*, *S. Chryſoſtome*, *Theophilactus*, *Oecumenius*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Hierome* and *S. Auguſtine* ſay, that not a declination, but a deſolation

« is necessary.

XIII. « But *Luther*, *Illyricus* & *Chytræus*, obiect, that this demon-
« stration maketh most of all for them: for it was foretould by
« *S. Iohn Apoc.* 13. that the Beast, which signifieth the *Roman*
« Empire, was to be wounded to death, and healed againe
« by Antichrist, which surelie was then done, when the
« Pope restored againe the west Empire which was almost
« perished, by giuing to *Charles* the Great the title and di-
« gnity of Emperour: therefore out of this transferring or re-
« storing of the Empire it is manifestly gathered, that the
« Pope of *Rome* is truly Antichrist. See *Illyricus l. contra primatū*
« *Papæ. & Centur. 8. cap. 10. col. 751.* and *Chytræus in cap. 13.*
« *Apoc. Illyricus* confirmeth this argument out of *S. Ambrose* who
« expounding the wordes of *S. Paul 2. Thess. 2.* saying, that
« *Antichrist shall restore the Romans their freedome, but vnder his owne*
« *name*: which the Pope seemeth to haue done, when he crea-
« ted an Emperour for the *Romans*, who notwithstanding
« should depend vpon him.

XIV. « I answere, we read not in *S. Iohn*, that Antichrist
« should heale the Beast which signified the *Roman* Empire;
« but this we read, that one of the Beastes heads should dye, &
« a little after rise againe by the dragons, that is, the diuells
« meanes, which almost all the ancient writers expound of
« Antichrist himselfe, who will faigne himselfe dead, and by
« the diuells art will rise againe, that he may imitate the true
« death, and resurrection of Christ, and by that meanes he
« will seduce many.

XV. « So expoundeth it *S. Gregorie l. 11. ep. 3. Primasius, Beda,*
« *Haymo, Anselmus, Richardus, & Rupertus in cap. 13. Apoc.* and
« the text it selfe doth plainely compell vs, by that head of the
« Beast which was dead, and became alyue againe, not to
« vnderstand *Charles* the Great, but Antichrist; for that head
« as *S. Iohn* writeth had power onlie two and fourtie mo-
« nethes, and blasphemed God, and those which dwell in
« Heauen, and ruled ouer all *Tribes, People, Languages & Nations*,
« and all which dwell vpon the earth adored it; of which
« thinges wee haue not seene or read any in *Charles* the Great,
« or in any of his successors: for *Charles* raigned longer then 42.
« monethes, neither did he blaspheme God and his Saintes,

but

but rather gaue them wonderfull reuerence, and many of his ſucceſſors haue imitated his pietie.

Finallie neither *Charles* himſelfe, nor any of his ſucceſſors ruled ouer euerie *Tribe, People, Tongue, & Nation*, as is manifeſt to all men. Now *S. Ambroſe* ſaith not, that Antichriſt ſhall create a new *Roman* Empire which the Pope did, but that hauing ouerthrowne the *Roman* Empire, he ſhall reſtore the *Romans* their libertie; which wee read not that any Pope hath done. XVI.

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downã* vtterly, denieth *that there ſhould be ſuch an vtter deſolatiõ of the Empire, as that there ſhould not remaine ſo much as the name of the Emperour or King of the Romans*, and then explicateth at large, how farre he thinketh it neceſſary that the Emperour ſhould be taken out of the way. But now it is no tyme for him to explicate his owne opinion, but to anſwere to *Bellarmines* argument: wherfore hauing denied the aſſertion, let vs ſee, what he can ſay to the proofes, for all the reſt is altogeather impertinent. XII.

2. Firſt then he anſwereth to the two places of *Daniel* 2. and 7. togeather, ſeeking many ſillie ſhiftes to eſcape the force of them, as that *vpon the deſolation of the Empire in the VVeſt, it was deuyded among ten Kinges at the leaſt; whereof none was called King of the Romans*. Whereby he would inferre, that the diuiſion of the Roman Empire into ten Kinges, argueth not the vtter deſolation thereof, ſince at that tyme there were 10. Kinges at the leaſt, and yet beſides a Roman Emperour in the Eaſt. But I would aske *M. Downam*, whether thoſe ten Kinges had all, or only part of the Roman Empire deuided amongſt them? and if he muſt needes anſwere, *only part*, thẽ it is no meruaile, though there were a Roman Emperour togeather with them; but the miracle had bene, if *M. Downã* could haue ſhewed vs ten Kinges, that had all the whole Empire deuided among them; and yet haue found vs a Romã Emperour that had ſome part of it; which becauſe he neither hath, nor can doe, therefore when thoſe ten Kinges II. Ten Kinges ſhall deuide thẽ whole Roman Empire among them, ſo that there ſhalbe no Roman Emperour in their tyme.

shall come, that *Daniel* speaketh of, there shalbe no Roman Emperour as there was in the tyme of those Kinges which *M. Downam* mentioneth, by which we plainely see, that he spake from the purpose of a quite different matter from *Daniel*, who likewise speaketh of ten Kinges who should succeed the Roman Emperours: euen as they had succeeded the *Grecians*, and these the *Persians*, and these againe the *Assyrians*; wheras *M. Downam* telleth vs of 10. Kinges, who liued togeather with the *Roman* Emperours. And by this tyme I thinke *M. Downam* will wish, that he had *not returned Bellarmines argument vpon him*, since he seeth, how little credit and how great shame will returne to himselfe by this returning. For not only *Bellarmine*, but any other, though neuer so meane a scholler will laugh to heare *M. Downam* inferre vpon the comming of those his westerne Kinges, the cōming of *Antichrist* also, who they know is not to come, so long as there is any Roman Emperour remayning, how many Kinges soeuer besides come or go; and they will likewise smile at *M. Downams* cunning, which he vsed to bring in this returning Argument, in that he putteth *Bellarmins* argument into a new forme, and maketh him immediatly infer the not comming of Antichrist, by the not comming of the 10. Kinges, wheras he only proueth the vtter desolation of the Roman Empire by their comming, and succeding in al the Dominions of that Empire; & finally som of his friends will wish, that he had kept that diuersity of reading the Scripture (*some hauing after the Beast, others with the Beast*) till it might haue stood him in better steed.

Downam changeth Bellarmines argument.

Apc. 17. 12.

But yet you shall heare *M. Downam* dispute more deeply, for hauing cited part of *Bellarmines* words, he setteth downe his first answere in these wordes. *Answere* 1. *This argumentation of Bellarmine implieth a contradiction, for if there be in Daniel described a succession of Kingdomes, which shall continue to the end of the world, whereof the Roman is the last; then the Roman Empire shall not vtterly be destroyed before the comming of Antichrist, which goeth before the end of the world.* But what will you say, *M. Downam*, if the Roman Empire be not the last Kingdome, which *Daniel* describeth? Will you cōfesse that it shalbe destroyed, before the comming of Antichrist, as well as before the end of the world

world? Doth not *Bellarmyne* vrge out of *Daniel*, as the laſt ſucceſſion, ten Kinges ſignified by the ten toes, and the ten hornes? Is not all this diſputation about them? Are you growne into that heate of paſſion, that you forget what you impugne? Surely thē it is time for you to diſpute no longer, and if you will needes be doing, at leaſtwiſe, take heed of theſe *returning arguments*.

Downam forgetteth what he impugneth

Thirdly *M. Downā* confeſſing, that he leaueth *the cōmon opinion*, and followeth another *of the learned, eſpecially of theſe later times*, affirmeth, that the 4. Kingdome mentioned in thoſe Chapters of Daniel, is *that Kingdome of the Seleucidæ, & Lagidæ which tyrannized ouer the people of Iury*; the former being *Kings of Syria*, & the later of *Egypt*: but this he proueth not any otherwiſe, but by a bare repetitiō of the ſame aſſertion, though he beginneth with a (*For*) as though he would haue ſaid ſomething, but we are cōtent to think, that he hath ſomwhat in ſtore for hereafter: ſince he promiſeth, that hereafter this ſhalbe ſhewed to be moſt true, only in the meane time he muſt giue vs leaue to hold the *cōmon opiniō* till we know who theſe learned men be, that durſt inuent a new particuler opinion except they can *proue it moſt clearly*, as *M. Downā* ſaith and we will belieue, whē we ſee it, for now it ſeemeth very probable, that thoſe iron leggs ſignify the Roman Empire, as well for their length, as *Bellarmine* well noted, & *M. Downā* negligently if not craftily omitted in the allegation of his wordes, putting in an (*&c.*) when he came to that place, as alſo for their ſtrength, in which the 4. Beaſt alſo excelleth, as the Prophet himſelfe expreſſeth: *Quomodo ferrū comminuit & domat omnia, ſic cōminuet, & conteret omnia hæc.* As iron breaketh and tameth all thinges, ſo ſhall (that kingdome) breake and teare in peeces all theſe former kingdomes: neither would I haue the Reader deceaued with the oppoſition of *learned*, to *common*, which he findeth made by *M. Downam*, by thinking that he meant, that the ancient opinion was houlden only by the common ſort of people: for no doubt he will acknowledg *Bellarmine* to be as learned as him ſelfe, no diſpraiſe to him, who is the only learned man that yet he expreſſeth to hould this new opinion; and beſides he will not eaſily condemne *S. Irenæus*, whom *Bellarmine* cy-

See. Chap. 16.

The Roman Empire ſignifyed by the 2. iron leggs of Nabucodonozors ſtatua & the 4. beaſt. *Dan.* 7.

cyteth for vnlearned; and yet his once not vouchsafing to name him, may make some doubtfull, and therefore I will adde *S. Hierome*, whome no man but an ignorant will accompte vnlearned. He therfore vpon this verie place *Daniel* 2. saith: *Regnũ quartum perspicuè pertinet ad Romanos.* The 4. Kingdome perspicuously belõgeth to the Romãs: & *cap.* 7. *Quartũ quod nunc orbem tenet terrarum, Imperiũ Romanorũ est.* The fourth which now possesseth the world, is the Empire of the Romans. Thus much for the fourth Beast, and Iron leggs.

But now concerning the ten toes, and ten hornes, *M. Downams learned* opinion is, that by them were signified *the ten Kinges of the two foresaid Kingdomes, which successiuelie vsurped dominion ouer the Iewes*, but for his proofes and authors, he remitteth vs to heereafter, as in the former, and soe wee must be content to expect his leasure: neither will we do him that iniury, to accompt *Porphyrius*, against whom *S. Hierome* writeth cap. 7. to be one of his great *learned* men, though his opinion be somewhat like; for by the 4. Beast he vnderstãdeth not the *Romã* Empire, but *Alexander* the great his 4. successors: and afterward for the ten hornes reckoneth vp ten Kinges, till *Antiochus* syrnamed *Epiphanes*, which ruled in *Macedonia, Syria, Asia,* & *Egypt*, and all this to the end, that those wordes *os loquens ingentia*, might be thought to be spoken of *Antiochus*, and not of Antichrist. But howsoeuer *M. Downam* wilbe ashamed to partake with this Apostata: yet am I sorie, that he commeth so neere, and must be inforced to oppose himselfe, not onlie against *S. Hierome*, but also against all Ecclesiasticall writers till his tyme, for so he affirmeth: *Dicamus, quod omnes Scriptores Ecclesiastici tradiderunt, in consummatione mundi quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros Reges, qui orbem Romanum inter se diuidant, & vndecimum surrecturũ &c.* Let vs say that which all Ecclesiasticall writers haue deliuered vnto vs, that in the end of the world when the *Roman* Kingdome is to be destroyed, there shalbe ten Kinges, who shall deuide the Romã world among them, & that there shall arise an elcuenth little King &c. But if *M. Downam* wilbe so mad, as to oppose himselfe to them all; surelie we haue no reason to follow him, but rather to endeauour to recall him, as we hartilie wish we might.

By the 10. toes of Nabuchodonozors Statua & the 10. hornes of the 4. beast *Dan.* 7. are signified the ten Kinges which shall deuide the Roman Empire among them.

Downam ioyneth with *Porphyry* an Apostata against all Ecclesiasticall writers.

Finallie

Finallie *M. Downam* is content *to suppose, that* Daniel *had spoken in those places of the Roman Empire*, and then he will haue *the* 10. *hornes, and* 10. *toes, to signifie the seuerall Kinges of that kingdome*; which euasion verie worthilie he confirmeth by the example *of the Seleucidæ* & *Lagidæ* their Kingdomes and Kinges, which were not all one, and yet the Kingdomes in his exposition were signified by the fourth Beast and iron legges, and the Kinges by the 10. hornes, and 10. toes. And is not *M. Downam* a wise man, thinke you, to confirme one absurditie with another farre greater, and which he knoweth his aduersary will much lesse graunt, then that, which he goeth about to proue? Besides that, this deuise is so fooliſh that euery child will laugh at *M. Downam* for it; for who seeth not, that the King succeedeth not his Kingdome, as the ten toes doe the iron legges, and the ten hornes by the consent of all Ecclesiasticall writers the 4. beast; but must of force be vnited togeather? except we will make the Kingdomes of the *Seleucidæ*, and *Lagidæ*, or of the *Romans*, to haue byn without their Kings and Emperours, and afterward againe the Kinges & Emperours without their States: which is so grosse an absurditie, as mee thinkes *M. Downam* should see it; and it is little lesse, to call these Kinges the toes of their Kingdomes, whereas euerie man els accompteth them the heads, in respect of their owne Kingdomes, howsoeuer in respect of others, they may be called toes, because of their succession in the last place. And by this, that hath byn said, I doubt not it will appeare to the iudicious Reader, whether *Bellarmines* argument, or *M. Downams* answere be more impertinent and friuolous.

Downam childishly confirmeth one absurditie with another farre greater.

3. To the second proofe out of the *Apocal.* 17. *M. Downam* hath very little to answere & therfore he is glad to take hould of euery word spoken *obiter*, and by the way; as that *Rome* is the Harlot, wherof *S. Io.* speaketh, and that the seauen heads signify all the Emperours of *Rome*: the first of which *M. Downam* liketh very well, but the second he affirmeth to be vntrue, because they are numbred, *fiue are fallen, the sixt is, and the 7. is not yet come*; in which point I will not now much cõtend; because *M. Downam* confesseth, that it is besides the purpose. And if hereafter he can bring any other exposition more

III. Apoc. 17.

more probable, he ſhall find me very ready to allow of it,
Downam not moderate in his cenſure. though he might haue vſed more moderation in his cenſure, ſince he cannot chooſe but know, that many great authors haue taken the number of 7. in this place indefinitely; as without all queſtion in many other places it is to be taken; and his difficulty muſt be ſolued by himſelfe, ſince that in this very chapter he affirmeth that *Apoc.* 13. by the Beaſt with 7. heades is meant the *Roman* State, and that vnder the *Roman* Emperours eſpecially: and yet by the head which was wounded, which he maketh the 6. he likewiſe vnderſtandeth the State of the Emperours, which beſides the difficulty common to *Bellarmine*, inuolueth a contradictiō peculier to *M. Downam*. Neither will I ſtand now to diſcuſſe with *M. Downam*, whether *Rome* be the Seate of Antichriſt or no, or how, and in what ſtate; only I muſt aduiſe him, that *Bellarmine* affirmeth not, that the *VVhore of Babylon is the ſeate of Antichriſt*, as neither that *Rome after the deſolation of the Empire is the VVhore of Babylon*: but theſe are *M. Downams* owne additions, which if he will haue graunted, he muſt firſt proue them in their due places.

See cap. 13.

But now to come to that, which *Bellarmin* would proue; *M. Downam* firſt is inforced to yeild, that *theſe ten hornes ſignify* 10. *Kinges, which ſhall raigne togeather*, and only can help himſelfe with affirming, *that theſe are not the ſame ten hornes whereof* Daniel *ſpeaketh, which raigned ſucceſſiuelie*. For which point I remit my ſelfe to that, which hath byn ſaid in the former proofe; beſides that it is no ſmall confirmation that *S. Iohn* muſt needes be vnderſtood of 10. Kinges, which raigne togeather, ſince their wordes are ſo like, and *S. Iohn* may be thought to expound *Daniel*, whome heere *M. Downam* citeth *cap.* 11 perhaps through the Printers fault; ſince that chapter maketh not to his purpoſe, and therefore was neuer mētioned in the whole precedent diſcourſe. Well it is now at length agreed vpon, that there ſhall 10. Kinges raigne togeather. Wherfore it only remayneth to proue, that in the time of theſe 10. Kings, there ſhal be no *Roman* Emperour, & conſequently that the *Roman* Empire ſhalbe vtterly deſtroyed; and ſo it is tyme for *M. Downam* to beſtirre himſelfe: and to vſe al his iugling tricks. Firſt then he bringeth in *Bellarmines* firſt

firſt propoſition, in the beginning of the queſtion for an argument in this place, and not truly neither. But it will be beſt to heare M. *Downams* owne wordes. *How then* (ſaith he) *doth Bellarmine proue, that before Antichriſt commeth, the Roman Empire ſhall be ſo vtterly deſtroyed, as not the name of a Roman Emperour or King of the Romans ſhould remayne? becauſe the Empire ſhall be deuided among* 10. *Kinges which are not Roman Kinges &c.* Wheras *Bellarmines* wordes are theſe: *VVe muſt know that the Roman Empire is at length to be deuided into ten Kinges, of which none ſhalbe, or be called King of the Romans:* whereyou ſee not only the being, but alſo the name of *Roman* Kinges is excluded. *But* (ſaith M. *Downam*) *he that is none of thoſe* 10. *Kinges, may haue the name of the Emperour or King of the Romans; as namely the beaſt which was, & is not, though it be, which is the* 8. *head, and is one of the* 7. *that is to ſay, the Emperour erected by the Pope.*

This found and fooliſh conceipt, that the beaſt which was, and is not, is the Emperour erected by the Pope, ſhall in other places be largely confuted. Now I would only know, how this Emperour can be, when the whole Empire is deuided among thoſe other 10. Kinges, as *Bellarmine* affirmeth, and proueth out of this very place, as we ſhould haue ſeene ere this, had not M. *Downam* interrupted vs with his impertinent diſgreſſions, which perhaps foreſeeing and fearing, he putteth another queſtion ſomewhat more to the purpoſe. *And why may none of theſe be called the King of the Romans? firſt forſooth, becauſe they ſhall hate Rome, and make her deſolate.* But he might haue kept his (*firſt*) & (*forſooth*) in his purſe inſteed of money: for *Bellarmine* giueth but one reaſon, which is the foreſaid wordes of Scripture, adding only the expoſition of them, which becauſe M. *Downam* could not impugne, he though beſt to deuide, that ſo hauing ſeparated the expoſition from the place of Scripture, the one might want authority, and the other be eaſily ſhifted of, as he doth in theſe words: *As though he that hath the title of the King of the Romans, may not hate Rome, notwithſtanding that title, as indeed ſome of the Emperours haue done:* which euaſion had byn too ridiculous, if he had added *Bellarmines* expoſition, to wit, that the Scripture teſtifieth that theſe *Kings ſhal hate the harlot, and make her deſolate and naked, and ſhall eate her flesh, and ſhal burne her with fire, be-*

cause they shall so deuide the Roman Empire amongst them, that they shall vtterlie destroy it. Where by the way *M. Downam* may vnderstād, that by *Rome* is not onlie vnderstood the particuler Citty, but also the whole *Roman* Empire, of which in *S. Iohns* tyme *Rome* was the head, and so denominated the whole, as that which the *Logicians* would call *principale Analogatum*. Now, how can the vtter destruction of this *Romā* Empire be more significantlie declared, then by being hated, made desolate, and naked, haue her flesh eaten, and finallie be burnt with fire? And how can anie man imagine, but that the 10. Kinges which shall bring all this to passe shalbe vtter enemies aswell of the Emperours so long as there are any, as likewise of the Empire? And by this tyme I imagine *M. Downam* will be perswaded that *Bellarmine* vsed no circular disputation, but confirmed his doctrine by an expresse place of Scripture. But least there should want a circular disputation, *M. Downam* bringeth in an *experience* approoued onlie by his owne opinion, but altogeather denied by *Bellarmine* & all Catholikes, of the *Roman Empire alreadie dissolued, & deuided betwixt Antichrist & ten Kinges, the title & name of Emperour still remayning*; by which to anie iudicious Reader hee maketh himselfe so ridiculous, that his bragging of his former proofs out of this place, that *Antichrist* is come, and that the Pope is Antichrist, will hardlie be beleiued, and at least wise I doubt not, but men will staie their censure, till they see those proofes examined.

The Roman Empire destroied by the 10 Kings.

Downams *petitio principij*.

4. *M. Downam* comming to the third proofe, verie courteously admitteth it, because it is so manifest that he could not deny it, that 2. *Thess.* 2. is to bee vnderstood of the *Roman* Empire: but then he manfully denieth that either *the Apostle or anie of the Fathers, excepting* Lactantius, *whose prophecie* (saith *M. Downā*) *in this point the Papists themselues do think to be erroneous, do say that the Empire of* Rome *shall so vtterly be abolished, as that not so much as the name of the Emperour or King of the Romans shall remaine*. Where first wee haue the authoritie of *Lactantius* so plaine, as no euasion can be found to shift it of; and therefore *M. Downam* is inforced to call his propheſie erroneous, and is not ashamed to affirme, that it is held so by Catholikes, euen in this point. For confirmation of which he

IV. 2. *Thess.* 2. V. VI.

he is alleadged by *Bellarmine*, which no doubt is a point of egregious impudency. But wee ſee noe cauſe, why wee ſhould not more eſteeme the authority of *Lactantius*, ſo ancient and learned a writer, then of a thouſand *M. Downams*, eſpeciallie ſince both the Scripture, and Fathers fauour his opinion ſo greatly. For what is *de medio fieri*, but to be quite taken away? and I belieue *M. Downam* would bee loath to ſtand to the hazard, if there were order giuen by ſome in authoritie, *vt ipſe de medio fieret*. And this the Fathers tooke to be ſo plaine, that they thought it needed no expoſition, though ſometime they vſe other words, which ſignifie the ſame vtter deſolation, as *S. Cyril*, *when the tymes of the Roman Empire are expired*; Tertull. *when the Empire is ouerthrowne*; S. Ambroſe, *after the defectiõ & abolitiõ*; S. Hierom, *except all Nations which are ſubiect to the Roman Empire, reuolt from them: and vnles the Roman Empire be firſt deſolate, paſſe, and bee takẽ away*. And *S. Auguſtine* oppoſeth to be takẽ out of the way, to raigning. So that when the Emperour is taken out of the way, hee ſhall raigne no longer, which is all one as to ſaie, he ſhalbe no longer Emperour. Surelie it is hard to expreſſe the vtter deſolatiõ of any Kingdome, with more ſignificant wordes. And yet *Bellarmine* tould *M. Downam* a verie good reaſon, why both the Apoſtle, and the Fathers would ſpeake ſomewhat ſparinglie in this point, to wit leaſt it might be offenſiue to the Roman Emperours, in whoſe tymes they liued, and therefore wee ſee how fearefullie *Lactantius* ſpeaketh, & how *Tertullian* bringeth it in without offence, ſaying, that *Chriſtians praie for the continuance of the Roman Empire*. And *M. Downam* might haue done well to haue found vs out ſome one Father, that had fauoured his expoſition; which he neglected, not for want of good will, as wee ſee plainelie by his citing of *S. Hierome*, *Qui tenebat, de medio fit &c.* which hee tranſlateth, *He which held, is taken away &c.* putting the preterperfect, for the preſent tenſe, and ſo he ſhould haue ſaid, *He which held, is in taking away*, or haue added ſome other ſigne, which might haue ſignified that it was in doing, but not done, which is moſt true, both in *S. Hieroms* tyme, and euer ſince, & before too; and the neerer we ſee the Roman Empire to draw to an end, the neerer we may likewiſe thinke,

Downãs impudencie.

How many wayes the Fathers affirme the vtter deſtructiõ of the Romã Empire & why they ſpake ſparingly of this point.

IV.

Downam tranſlateth not well.

that Antichriſt draweth, as *S. Hierome* affirmeth: but till that (*fit*) be made (*factus eſt*) that is, till the Roman Empire be vtterlie ouerthrowne indeed, Antichriſt ſhall not come, how neere ſoeuer he be, which *S. Hierome*, and all the Fathers plainely affirme, as we haue ſeene. Neither can *M. Downam* himſelfe think, that the Empire was taken away in ſuch ſort in *S. Hieromes* time, as was neceſſary before Antichriſts comming and reuealing, ſince that he himſelf dareth not affirme, that he came then in ſuch ſort, as *S. Paul* deſcribeth 2. *Theſſ.* 2. Wherfore he muſt either reiect *S. Hierom* in this alſo, or els expound him, as I haue done. And it is a prettie matter, that the Apoſtle, and the Fathers telling vs, that the Roman Empire hindereth Antichriſts comming; *M. Downam* ſhould ſtill beare vs downe, that the Empire as it is now, hindereth not Antichriſt, but rather furthereth. But I hope men will rather haue the Apoſtle, and the Fathers to ſtand by them in the day of iudgment, when they ſhall giue accompt of their fayth, in this point, then *M. Downam*, who will haue more then he can doe, to anſwere for himſelfe. The Holy Ghoſt wel foreſaw, that the *Roman* Empire ſhould be in theſe tymes, as we now ſee it, and no doubt would not haue affirmed ſo abſolutely, that it hindereth Antichriſts comming, if at any tyme it could haue bene togeather with him, or haue furthered him; otherwiſe we might haue a iuſt excuſe for our miſtaking. Neither is the Empire now ſo greatly diminiſhed, as *M. Downam* would giue vs to vnderſtand: for there is *now an Emperour of the Romans indeed, and not only in title without the thing it ſelfe*, as we ſee the whole world acknowledgeth, euen the Proteſtants themſelues; and who but *M. Downam* would affirme that the Emperour that now is, *hath no Prouinces*? For as for *Rome* he graunteth, that it is not neceſſary, that he ſhould haue it. Is a great part of *Germany* nothing with *M. Downam*? It ſhould ſeeme, that he is become a great deſpiſer of the world, ſince that which all Chriſtian, & Infidell Princes and people eſteeme ſo much, he accounpteth nothing.

VII. VIII. There is now a Roman Emperour indeed, & not in name or title only. IX. X. XI.

5. To conclude this Chapter, *M. Downam* goeth about to reply vpon *Bellarmines* anſwere to the obiection of *Luther* & the

the reſt; and telleth vs, that *it is euident, that the former Beaſt Apoc.* 13. *figureth not Antichriſt, but the Roman ſtate, and that vnder the Roman Emperours eſpecially*; but it had bene wel, that he would haue ſhewed vs this euidence: for neither we, nor the Fathers which *Bellarmine* citeth, to whom we may adde *S. Ireneus l.* 5. *cap.* 28. *Arethas, S. Methodius*, and *S. Hippolytus in orat. de conſummatione mundi*, can ſee any ſuch euidence, but rather the contrary, to wit, that the former beaſt ſignifyeth Antichriſt at leaſt in one of his heads, which might be playnly gathered out of the Text, if it were our turne to proue, as it is *M. Downams*. But ſince we muſt anſwere, only his authority auouching a new expoſition without reaſon, moueth vs very little. Secondly *M. Downam* telleth vs, that *it is not ſaid, that one of the heads did faigne it ſelfe dead, and by the help of the Diuell did riſe againe (which needeth not* (ſaith he) *if the death were counterfait) but that one of the heads had receaued a deadly wound, and was cured againe*. But wee knew thus much before he tould vs ſo; neither doth *Bellarmine* affirme, that the Scripture hath that expoſition in it ſelfe, for then what need we ſeeke for any other. The words of the Scripture are, *Vidi vnum de capitibus ſuis, quaſi occiſum in mortem. I ſaw one of his heades, as it were ſlaine to death*. Where we ſe a (*quaſi*) which *M. Downam* omitted, but the Fathers made ſo great accoumpt of it, that they chiefely grounded their expoſition vpon it, eſpecially becauſe they knew very wel, that if it had byn no faigned, but a true and reall death, it had paſſed the diuels cunning to haue recouered him; except *M. Downam* will thinke that the Diuell can doe true miracles, as he ſeemeth to inſinuate, by ſaying, *that the Diuels help neded not, if the death were counterfait*; but yet wee will thinke better of him, then that he will fall to open blaſphemy, and will only tell him, that the Diuels cunning was very needfull to make this wound ſeeme ſo deſperate and mortall, and to faygne death ſo cunningly, that al ſhould remayne ſo fullie ſatisfied, and verily perſwaded, that the head had byn dead indeed, and was riſen againe by the power which the beaſt had by the Diuell.

XIII. XIIII. XV. XVI. The former beaſt, *Apoc.* 13. ſignifyeth Antichriſt. *Apoc.* 13. *See cap.* 15. §. 3. & 4. & *part.* 2. c. 3. *n.* 8.

But here wee muſt not paſſe ouer in ſilence *M. Downams* iuggling trickes: for in his opinion the ſecond Beaſt with two hornes is Antichriſt; for ſo he obiecteth to *Bel-*

larmine, that *he might haue read, that the second beast which is Antichrist, causeth the Image of the beast, that is, the new Empire to be made, and putteth life into it*. Now, this second beast had not yet appeared to *S. Iohn*, when the head of the former beast was healed by the power, which the Dragon had giuen to the former beast: yet is *M. Downam* content to apply this to the Pope also, not caring (as it seemeth) what he saith, so that he may seeme to say somthing against the Pope. But by the former beast, as wee haue seene, & *Luther, Illyricus* & *Chytræus* in their obiections suppose Antichrist is signified, by the latter his chiefe Precursor, and false Prophet, who shall cause his followers to erect Statua's, & Images of Antichrist, out of which by his procuring the Diuells shall speake, & giue answers, & other signes of life, as sometimes happened amõg the Pagãs & Idolators. And this is the exposition of the anciẽt Fathers: by which all *M. Downams* deuise of the new Empire erected by the Pope, becommeth too too foolish and ridiculous. And if I were to dispute, and not to answere, I would aske how the Roman Empire came to haue 7. heads togeather? Perhappes he might haue found two hornes, as the second beast had, by reason of the East and West Empire. But now I will not vrge him any further, since his folly is more then notorious already.

By the later beast *Apoc. 13.* is signified Antichrists false Prophet.

6. Finallie *M. Downam* would make vs belieue, *that Bellarmine fighteth with his owne shaddow*, when he inuincibly proueth, that the head which was healed, is not *Charles* the Great, for (saith he) *by the head is not meant any one Man, but the state and succession of Emperours*. And hath he not amended the matter well, thinke you, that wheras *Bellarmine* proueth, that it could not be *Charles*, because he raigned longer then 42. monethes, *M. Downam* answereth it is true, it could not be *Charles*, but yet *it might be the State and succession of Emperours*, as though this endured lesse tyme then *Charles*, conteyning both him and all the other Emperours? Can there be anie thing more ridiculous then this? And is *M. Downam* anie better then a *shaddow* for *Bellarmine* to fight withall? But yet he will haue one saying more, and so he telleth vs, *that which is added concerning the Vniuersality either of worship or rule, is not spokẽ of the head which was reuiued, but of the beast which was to haue one of his*

Downams ridiculous absurditie.

his ſeauen heads wounded to death, and cured againe. Well then, let *M. Downam* ſhew vs, where, or by whom the *Roman* Empire had either worſhip or rule after the head was healed, that is (in his opinion) after the Empire was reſtored by the Pope, but onlie in *Charles* the Great, and his Succeſſors? If he cannot ſhew vs any ſuch matter anie where els, let him confeſſe, that this Vniuerſalitie of rule and worſhip cannot be found in the *Roman* Empire, but onlie in Antichriſt; as neither he can ſhew vs, that anie of the *Roman* Emperours after *Charles* the Great *blaſphemed God and his Saintes*, ſo as this head or beaſt is ſaid to doe. But yet to doe him a courteſie, wee will not ſtick much to graunt him as probable, that the head is not Antichriſt himſelfe, but one of the 7. Kinges, which ſhall continue with Antichriſt, and follow & aſſiſt him in all his wickedneſſe, as he may ſee learnedly expounded in *Ribera* one of *Bellarmines* religion and order. And thus wee will cõclude, leauing the iudicious Reader to iudge, whether the Proteſtantes *are deceaued, thinking that the declination of the Empire was ſufficient for Antichriſts comming*, as *Bellarmine* modeſtelie affirmeth, after euident proofes: or the Catholikes *be in an errour, who thinke that Antichriſt commeth not before the vtter deſolation of the Roman Empire*, as *M. Downam* raſhelie auoucheth, only becauſe he would exceed *Bellarmine* in wordes, ſince he cannot come neere him in proofes.

Whether the woũded head. *Apoc.* 13 be Antichriſt or noe.

THE

THE SIXT CHAPTER.

Conteyning the third Demonſtration.

I. « THE third demonſtration (ſaith *Bellarmine*) is taken from the comming of *Henoch* and « *Helias*, who liue ſtill, and to this end, that « they may oppoſe themſelues to Antichriſt, « when he commeth, & conſerue the elect « in the Faith of Chriſt, and at length con- « uert the Iewes, which notwithſtanding « without doubt is not yet fulfilled. There be foure places of « Scripture concerning this matter; the firſt *Malac.* 4. *Behould* « *I will ſend* Elias *the Prophet vnto you, before the great daie of the Lord* « *commeth, and he will conuert the hartes of the Fathers to the Children,* « *and the hartes of the children to their Fathers.* The ſecond, *Eccle.* 48. « where we read of *Helias: VVho wert receaued in a whirle-wynd of* « *fire, in a whirle-wynd of fyery horſes: who art written in the iudgments* « *of tymes; to aſſwage the Lordes anger, to reconcile the hart of the Father* « *to the ſonne, and to reſtore the Tribes of Iſrael.* And *cap.* 44. *Henoch* « *pleaſed God, and was tranſlated into Paradiſe, to giue to Nations pen-* « *nance.* The third *Matth.* 17. *Helias indeed is to come, & ſhall reſtore* « *all thinges.* The fourth *Apoc.* 11. *I will giue to my two witneſſes, and* « *they ſhall propheſie* 1260. *dayes.*

11 « *Theodorus Bibliander* alleadgeth alſo all theſe places in his « Chronicle *tab.* 14. but he ſaith, that by *Henoch* and *Helias* are « vnderſtood all faithfull Miniſters, which God rayſeth in the « tyme of Antichriſt, of which ſort were *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and the

the reſt, and at length he concludeth. *Wherfore* (ſaith he) *it is a childiſh imaginatiõ, or a Iewiſh dream to expect either* Helias *or* Henoch, *as perſons deſcribed by their particuler proprieties*. And the ſame teacheth *Chytraus in Comment. Apoc.* 11. and they prooue it, becauſe thoſe thinges, which are ſaid of *Helias* by *Malachie*, our Lord taught vs to be vnderſtood of *S. Iohn Baptiſt, Matth.* 11. *He is* Helias *who is to come*. And *S. Hierom in cap. 4. Malach.* expoundeth it of *all the quire of Prophets*, that is to ſay, of the doctrine of all the Prophets.

But to vs it ſeemeth not a childiſh imagination, but a moſt true opinion, that *Henoch* and *Elias* ſhall come in their perſons, and that the contrary is eyther an hereſie, or an errour next doore to hereſy. It is proued firſt out of thoſe foure Scriptures: for that the wordes of *Malachie* cannot be vnderſtood of any Doctors whatſoeuer, as of *Luther, Zuinglius*, & the like, it is manifeſt, for *Malachie* ſaith, that the Iewes are to be conuerted by *Helias*, and that he is chiefly to be ſent for the Iewes, as is manifeſt by that: *I will ſend vnto you*. And in *Eccleſiaſticus*, *to reſtore the Tribes of Iacob*. But *Luther* and *Zuinglius* haue conuerted none of the Iewes. III.

That alſo they cannot be vnderſtood litterallie of *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, but only of *Helias*, it is manifeſt, becauſe *Malachie* ſpeaketh of the ſecond comming of our Lord, which ſhalbe to iudge: for ſo he ſaith: *Before the great and horrible day of the Lord commeth*: for the firſt comming is not called, *a great and horrible daie, but an acceptable tyme, and the day of ſaluation*. For which cauſe, it is alſo added, *Leaſt perhappes comming, I ſtrike the earth with anathema and curſe*, that is to ſay, leaſt comming to iudgment, and finding all wicked, I condemne all the earth: therfore I will ſend *Helias*, that I may haue ſome to ſaue. But in the firſt comming our Lord came not to iudge, but to be iudged, not to deſtroy, but to ſaue. IV.

To the wordes of our Lord *Matth.* 11. we wil anſwere a little after. To *S. Hierome* I ſay, that though *in Comment. Malach.* he did not thinke, that *Malachie* did ſpeake of the true *Helias*: yet *in comment. Matth.* 11. & 17. he thinketh & teacheth the contrary. Finallie *S. Auguſtine. lib.* 20. *Ciu. cap.* 29. witneſſeth, that *this is the common interpretation of the faith full*. V.

That likewiſe *Eccleſiaſticus* ſpeaketh of the perſons of *Henoch* VI.

« *noch & Helias*, and not of ſome other, it is prooued; for *Eccle-*
« *ſiaſticus* ſaith, that *Henoch* ſhall come *to giue the Nations pen-*
« *nance, who is tranſlated into Paradiſe*, and that *Helias* ſhall come
« *to reſtore the tribes of Iſrael*, who *was taken away in a chariot of fiery*
« *horſes*, which certainely agree not, but to thoſe particuler
« perſons.

VII. « In which place I cannot ſufficientlie meruaile, what
« came into Biſhop *Ianſenius* his mind, that expounding this
« place, he ſhould write: *Although it be the opinion of all the Ancients,*
« *that* Helias *ſhall come, yet it is not conuinced out of this place: for it*
« *may be ſaid, that* Eccleſiaſticus *wrote that according to the opinion*
« *receaued in his tyme, by which it was beliued out of the wordes of* Ma-
« lachie, *that* Helias *ſhall trulie come before the* Meſſias *in his owne*
« *perſon; whereas it was not to be fulfilled in his owne perſon, but in him*
« *who was to come in the ſpirit and vertue of* Helias. For if it be ſo as
« *Ianſenius* ſaith, it followeth, that *Eccleſiaſticus* erred, and wrote
« falſe thinges. But if I be not deceaued, *Ianſenius* changed his
« opinion, for writing *in Cap.* 17. *Matth.* he teacheth that the
« place of *Malachie* cannot be litterallie vnderſtood but of the
« true *Helias*, which he is likewiſe compelled to ſay of the
« place of *Eccleſiaſticus*, who without doubt expoundeth *Ma-*
« *lachy*.

« Now that the wordes of our Lord *Matth.* 17. are vn-
VIII. « derſtood of the true *Helias*, yt is plaine; becauſe *S. Iohn* was
« alreadie come, and had abſolued his courſe, and yet our
« Lord ſaith, *Helias* ſhall come: and that they are not vnder-
« ſtood of all doctors, but of one true *Helias*, it may be proued,
« firſt, becauſe the Apoſtles, who moued the queſtion of *Heli-*
« *as*, where *S. Peter*, *S. Iames*, and *S. Iohn*, and they tooke oc-
« caſion by the Transfiguration of our Lord, where they ſaw
« *Moyſes & Helias*; wherefore when they aske; *why therefore*
« *doe the Scribes ſay, that* Helias *muſt come firſt?* they ſpeake of that
« *Helias*, whome they had ſeene in the mountayne with Chriſt.
« Therefore Chriſt anſwering, *Helias indeed ſhall come & reſtore all*
« *thinges*, ſpeaketh alſo of that particuler Helias who had ap-
« peared in the Transfiguration. Secondly the ſame is mani-
« feſt out of thoſe wordes, *and he ſhall reſtore all thinges*; for *S. Io.*
« *Baptiſt* nor any other hath don that: for toreſtore all thinges
« is to recall all Iewes, and heretikes, and perhappes many
Catho.

Catholikes (deceaued by Antichriſt) to the true Faith. »

But *Bibliander* vrgeth, becauſe our Lord *Matth.* 11. ſaith » IX.
of *S. Io. Baptiſt*, *He is Helias, who is to come*, as if he had ſaid: »
He is the *Helias* promiſed by *Malachy*. I anſwere: Our Lordes »
meaning is, that *S. Iohn* was the *Helias* promiſed, not litte- »
rally, but allegoricallie; for therefore he ſaid firſt, *and if you* »
will receaue him, as if he ſaid, *Helias* indeed promiſed in his »
owne perſon is to come in the laſt comming; yet if you »
will haue alſo ſome *Helias* in the firſt comming, receaue *Iohn*; »
Therefore alſo he addeth: *He that hath eares to heare let him heare*, »
ſignifying, that it was a myſtery, that he had ſaid *S. Iohn* to be »
Helias.

Finally that the wordes of *S. Io. Apoc.* 11. are vnderſtood » X.
of the particuler perſons *Henoch* and *Helias*, not of all teachers, »
it is manifeſt by that which *S. Iohn* ſaith in the ſame place, »
that they *were to be killed* by Antichriſt, and that *their bodies* »
ſhould remayne vnburyed three dayes in the ſtreets of Hieruſalem, & »
that, *after three daies they ſhould riſe againe, and aſcend into Heauen*; »
which neuer happened to any hitherto.

Notwithſtanding *Dauid Chytraus* goeth about to an- » XI.
ſwere in his Commentary vpon that place, and he ſaith firſt, »
that *S. Iohn* would ſignifie, that many *Lutheran Miniſters* were »
to bee ſlaine by the Papiſtes, whome notwithſtanding God »
reſtoreth to life, when he taketh them vp to Heauen to »
liue for euer. Secondly he addeth a little after, that thoſe »
ſlaine Miniſters ſhall haue their corporall life reſtored them »
in the laſt daie of Reſurrection. Thirdlie and laſtly he addeth »
in the ſame place, that by this reſtoring to life, may alſo be »
ſignified, that wee ſee many other Miniſters raiſed by God, »
inſteed of thoſe which were ſlaine, with the ſame zeale »
& vertue. »

But theſe anſweres are too light: for the firſt cānot be de- » XII.
fended, becauſe the bleſſednes of the ſoule, is not the re- »
ſtoring of our life loſt, but an obteyning of a new life. Be- »
ſides, thoſe two witneſſes in the *Apocalyps* ſhall riſe againe »
before many, and ſhalbe lifted vp in Body, which certain- »
lie is not fulfilled in the bleſſednes of the ſoule. Likewiſe »
the ſecond ſolution is nothing worth, for *S. Iohn* ſaith, that »
thoſe two witneſſes ſhall riſe againe, before the laſt daie, »

to wit, while the state of this world endureth, for *S. Iohn* addeth, that their enemies shalbe *stroken into a great feare* by that resurrection, and that a little after, there shalbe *an earth-quak & that 7000. men shall perish*. Finally the third solution is not to the purpose, for the Scripture saith, that the very same which were dead *shalbe raised againe*, and assumpted into Heauen. But yet we see not any *Lutheran* Minister rise againe, or be taken vp to heauen. Likewise S. *Iohn* saith, that *Henoch* and *Helias*, *shall preach in sackcloth*, and the *Lutherans* beare such an hatred to sackloth, that if peraduenture they haue any when they become *Lutherans*, they forthwtth cast them away.

XIII. Secondlie, it is proued that *Helias*, and *Henoch* shall come in their owne persons in Antichrists tyme, by the consent of the Fathers. For of *Helias* so affirme *S. Hilarie*, *S. Hierome*, *Origen*, *S. Chrysostome*, and all other interpreters of *S. Matth. in cap.* 17. Likewise *Lactantius lib. 7. cap.* 17. and *Theodoret in cap. vltimum Malachiæ*, & *S. Augustine tract 4. in. Ioan.* and *Primas. in cap.* 11. *Apoc.*

XIV. Of *Henoch* and *Helias* togeather, so affirme many which write vpon the *Apoc.* as *Bede*, *Richardus*, *Arethas*, who also addeth, that *it is without varietie believed by the whole Church, that Henoch and Elias are to come to oppose themselues to Antichrist*. Likewise *S. Damascen lib. 4. cap. 28. S. Hippolytus martyr in orat. de consūmatione mundi*, and *S. Greg. lib. 14. cap. 12. & lib. 9. cap. 4. moral.* and *S. Augustine lib. 9. c. 6. de Gen. ad literam.*

XV. Thirdly it is proued, because otherwise there can be no reason giuen, why these two were taken away before their death, & liue still in mortall flesh, being at lēgth to dy: for although the Iewes as *Rab. Salomō in c. 5. Gen.* do say, that *Henoch* was slaine by God before his tyme, because he was light & inconstant; and they affirme that *Helias*, when he was carried vp in a fiery chariot was wholy cōsumed in body by that fier, and perhaps the *Lutherans* thinke the same, who deny, that they shall returne: yet all Catholikes certainly believe, that both of them liue in their bodyes: for that *Henoch* is not dead, the Apostle teacheth *Heb.* 11. *Henoch was translated, that he might not see death*; and that neither he, nor *Elias* be dead, and yet shall dye, besides the already cited, *S. Irenæus*, *Tertul-*

Tertullian, S. Hierom, S. Auguſtine, and Ephiphanius do teach.

S. Irenæus lib. 5. ſpeaking of Henoch & Helias. The Prieſts (ſaith he) which are the Diſciples of the Apoſtles affirme, that thoſe which are tranſlated, are tranſlated thither (to terreſtriall Paradiſe) and remayne there vntill the conſummation, contemplating incorruption. Tertull. lib. cont. Iudaos cap. 1. of Henoch ſaith thus: VVho hath not yet taſted death, as pretending eternitie. S. Epiphanius in Ancorato, of Henoch and Helias ſaith thus: Theſe two remayne in body and ſoule in reſpect of hope. S. Hierome in epiſt. ad Pamach. contra Ioannē Hieroſolymitanum. Henoch (ſaith he) is tranſlated in flesh: Helias being in flesh is taken vp to Heauen, not yet dead, and now inhabitours of Paradiſe &c. S. Aug. lib. de peccato orig. cap. 23. Henoch (ſaith he) and Helias we doubt not, liue in the bodies, in which they were borne. XVI.

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downams* firſt anſwere is, that though all this were true, to wit, *that Enoch & Helias were to come in their owne perſons, before the ſecond comming of Chriſt, and to oppoſe themſelues againſt Antichriſt* (all which he meaneth in his ſecond anſwere to deny:) *Yet it followeth not, that therfore Antichriſt ſhould not be come before their comming. It is ſufficient* (ſaith he) *that they come before his ouerthrow, and the ſecond comming of Chriſt: and therefore, if they were indeed to come, their comming might be yet expected, notwithſtanding the truth of our aſſertion, that Antichriſt is alreadycome.* But *M. Downam* did wiſely not to ſtand much vpon this ſolution, for he could not chooſe, but know, that *Henoch* and *Helias* were to preach very neere as long as Antichriſt was to perſecute and raigne, ſince that *Apoc.* 11. the tyme of their preaching is appointed to be 1260. daies which wanteth not much of three yeares and a halfe, or 42. moneths; which both *S. Iohn*, and *Daniel* appoint for Antichriſts Kingdome, and therfore *Bellarmine* had reaſon to affirme, that they were to come togeather, and to accompany one another, which likewiſe muſt needes be graunted by them, which admitt that the cauſe of their comming ſhallbe to oppoſe themſelues to Antichriſt, for it would

Helias & Henoch are to preach in a manner as long as Antichriſt is to raigne.

would be verie late to come a thousand yeares after, especially for them, which are dead so many yeares before; wherfore *M. Downam* was somthing to free in this first answere, but he will make a mends in his second, where he meaneth to deny all, that either the Scriptures or Fathers haue affirmed, concerning the comming of these two diuine witnesses.

2. And to begin this his second Answere, he first citeth *Bellarmines* wordes falselie, making him say thus: *There be 4. Scriptures to proue that Henoch and Helias in their owne persons shall come against Antichrist*. As though *Bellarmine* had affirmed, that in euerie Scripture of these foure, both *Henoch* and *Helias* had byn named, or at leastwise spoken of; for so *M. Downam* seemeth to charge him saying forthwith: *Howbeit this is a manifest vntruth, for no place of Scripture speaketh of Henoch his returne*. But *Bellarmines* words are these: *Quatuor Scripturæ exstat de hac re. There be foure Scriptures cocerning this matter*. Now whether any of these places speake of *Henoch* his returne or no, we shall see ere long: in the meane tyme it is sufficient, that the Reader note *M. Downams* shuffling, and that *Bellarmine* affirmeth not that all these Scriptures speake of *Henoch*, nor yet that he is named in any of them; wherefore his note in the first place, is either malicious, or foolish, that this place maketh *no mention of Henoch, but onlie of Helias*: for of this there was neuer made any question, but by himselfe.

Downam alleageth Bellarmines wordes falsfie.

Wherefore leauing these his shiftes, let vs heare what he can answere to that place of *Malachy*. He denieth that by *Elias, is meant Elias the Thesbite, but Iohn the Baptist*: which he will needes proue also, because Luc. 1. the Angell saith, that S. *Iohn should go before our Lord in the spirit and vertue of Helias, that he may turne the hartes of the Fathers vnto the Children &c.* but who seeth not, that this is onlie to be *Helias* spirituallie and vertuallie, or as *Bellarmine* speaketh, allegorically? which no Catholike denieth; but withall wee affirme, that *Helias* litterallie is to come in the tyme of Antichrist, as *Bellarm.* proueth out of the place of Malachy; which it seemeth *M. Downam* is loath to heare of, and therefore he interrupteth him so disorderly with prouing, when it is his turne to answere. But we will beare with his rudenesse, so that he will be satisfied

II. III. *Malach. 4.* *Luc. 1.*

tiſied with any reaſon. Wherfore ſecondly, he bringeth *Matth.* 11. where he ſaith, that *our Sauiour moſt plainely affirmeth, that Iohn Baptiſt is that Helias who was to come.* But we muſt tell him ere he paſſe any further, that he is ſomewhat too bould to change our Sauiours wordes, who not without great cauſe ſaid not, *who was to come*, as *M. Downã* would make him; but *who is to come*; ſignifying plainely, that *S. Iohn Baptiſt* comming had not fulfilled the propheſie of *Malachie*, ſince that *Elias* was ſtill to come after him, and conſequentlie that *S. Iohn Baptiſt* was onlie *Elias* ſpirituallie &c. as hath bene ſaid; becauſe he endeauoured to conuert the Iewes, which lyued then, as *Elias* ſhall do thoſe, which ſhall liue in the time of Antichriſt, & both of thẽ haue for office to prepare for our Sauiours comming, *S. Iohn* for the firſt, and *Elias* for the ſecond. I omit *M. Downams* expoſition of the other words in that place as impertinent, becauſe they are not to this purpoſe: and as for his railing, wee muſt be content to put vp that and more, at ſuch good fellowes handes.

I. IX. *Matth.* 11.

Downam corrupteth the Scripture.

Thirdly *M. Downã* alleageth *S. Hierome*, who affirmeth, *that the Iewes and Iudaizing Heretikes thinke, that before their Meſſias, Elias ſhall come, and reſtore all thinges. Hence it is, that vnto Chriſt this queſtion is propounded in the Ghoſpell, what is that, which the Phariſies ſay, that Elias ſhall come? To whom he anſwered: Elias indeed ſhall come, and if you will belieue, he is alreadie come: by Elias meaning Iohn. And therefore* (ſaith M. Downam) *in* Hieromes *iudgemẽt it is but the opinion of a Iudaizing heretike to expect the comming againe of Elias in his owne perſon.* But ſure wee are, that this is not *S. Hieromes* iudgement, if wee ſpeake of the ſecond comming of our Sauiour, ſince hee himſelfe in the 17. of *Matth.* affirmeth of *Helias*, that *he ſhall come then iuxta corporis fidem, in bodilie preſence*, and that in the firſt comming, *he came by S. Iohn in vertue and ſpirit*; by which it moſt plainelie appeareth, that hee onlie condemneth them for Iewes and Iudaizing heretikes, which will not receaue any *Meſſias*, till they firſt ſee *Elias* in his owne perſon, becauſe they expound the Prophet *Malachy* of the firſt comming of the *Meſſias*, as *M. Downam* doth: only they differ that *M. Downã* thinketh, that Helias is not litterally ſpoken of. In which point he erreth more groſſely then they, as we ſhall ſee afterward.

I. V.

3. Now

3. Now, that *M. Downam* hath spent his owne proofes he is content to begin to answere *Bellarmines*, who proueth that *Malachy* speaketh of the second comming, because he calleth it *a great and horrible day*. Where *M. Downam* is not ashamed to say, that *Bellarmine* giueth *the lie to the spirit of God, speaking in the Angel*, Luc. 1. and our Sauiour Matth. 11. & 17. But surely he deserueth to haue the lye giuen him, that is not afraid nor ashamed to behaue himselfe so impudently. Well it is our hard happe to haue to doe with such men. Let vs see, what he answereth: *for the application of the Angell, and our Sauiour*, wee haue already seene, that it was only a spirituall, vertuall, or allegoricall application, which hindereth not the litterall sense of the second comming; as *Bellarmine* proueth. But *M. Downam* answereth to his argument, that the first comming may also be called terrible, which he confirmeth out of *Malac.* 3. *v.* 1. *where he speaketh most plainly of the first comming, and yet saith: who may abyde the day of his comming? and who shall endure, when he appeareth, for he is like a purging fier, and like fullers sope, and he shall sit downe to try, and fine the siluer*. But we may well oppose the authority of *S. Augustine* to *M. Downam*, without doing him iniury. He therfore *lib.* 18. *Ciu. cap.* 35. and *lib.* 20. *cap.* 25. *&* 26. as likewise *Euseb. lib.* 5. *demonst. Euang. cap.* 28. and *Theodoretus* expound these wordes of the second comming, though immediately before the Prophet spake of the first. But yet we will do *M. Downam* the courtesy to graunt that they are to be vnderstood of the first with *S. Cyril*, *Rupertus* and others, so that he will admit their interpretation in other points: for the sense is; who can so much as think how great the glory of this day is, by reason of the benefites which the *Messias* shall bring with him to mankind? and who can sufficiently admire or rather looke vpon so great a light and goodnesse? For he shalbe like a purging fyre, by reason of the labours and afflictions, or rather of the holy Ghost, which shall come in fyery tongues, with which he shall purge the hartes of those which belieue in him, & like the sope or herbe of Fullers, by reason of his grace, with which he shall make the soules of men most pure and white; and he shall do this most seriously, and with great diligence All which signifyeth not the terrible and horrible day, but

Malach. 3. *v.* 1.

Downams impudency.

an

an acceptable and healthſome tyme. And heere by the way wee may note, what little reaſon *M. Downam*, and his fellowes haue to leaue *S. Hieromes* vulgar tranſlation, who hath: *Quis poterit cogitare*, and tranſlate with other interpreters, *Quis ſuſtinebit*? Except they would admit the former expoſition of them, which read it ſo? But they will admit what they liſt, and reiect what they liſt, and one while they will haue vs beliue, that the Ghoſpell terrifieth not at all, and an otherwhile, that it terrifieth as much as the old law, yea much more, euen aſmuch as the ſecond comming of our Lord to iudgment. But ſince they take ſo much liberty to teach what they liſt, we may likewiſe take leaue to beliue them, ſo farre as we liſt.

Downam admitteth what interpretation, and Tranſlation he liſteth

VVel, let vs ſee how *M. Downam* goeth forward to proue that the firſt comming of our Lord may be called terrible: Of the ſame comming (ſaith he) the prophet ſpeaketh in the beginning of the 4. Chap. *Behould the day commeth that shal burne as an ouen* &c. ſhewing how terrible it ſhalbe to the wicked. *But vnto yow that feare my name* (ſaith the Lord *v.* 2.) *shall the sunne of righteousnes arise, and health shalbe vnder his winges* &c. But here we are conſtrayned to forſake *M. Downam*, ſince both Iewes and Chriſtians conſent, that theſe wordes are to be vnderſtood of the day of iudgment, and the wordes themſelues are ſo playne, that they need no interpretation: and it was tyme for him to adde (*&c.*) in both periods, for otherwiſe euery man would haue ſeene, that the *proud and wicked are not to be consumed as stubble cast into the fire* till then, as neyther, *that they shall be trodden vnder the feete of the iust like ashes*, as the Prophet affirmeth that they ſhall be in this great and terrible day. Wherfore this illation maketh plainely for vs, if *M. Downam* will ſhew vs as much courteſie now, as we did him in the former Chapter, that is, to graunt, that the Prophet continueth ſtill to ſpeake of the ſame comming; though indeed we need no ſuch fauour, ſince that in the very place in controuerſy, this comming is called great and horrible, as *Bellarmine* vrgeth. But *M. Downam* goeth on ſtill with his citations *Matth.* 3. 10. *Now is the axe laid to the roote of the tree &c.* and *verſe* 11. & 12. *He that commeth after me is mightier then I: he will baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with fier, who hath his fanne in*

Malach. 4.

Downam cutteth of the words which make moſt to the purpoſe.

Matth. 3.

his hand (vſing the like ſimilitude that *Malachy* did) *and will purge his floore, & gather his wheat into his Granary, but wil burne vp the chaffe with vnquenchable fier.* All which maketh very little to the purpoſe: for the ſenſe is, that heerafter the Iewes ſhall haue no priuiledge aboue other Nations, by being the children of *Abraham*, except they did imitate his workes: and that our Sauiours Baptiſme was of more force, thē *S. Iohn Baptiſts*, becauſe he would ſend the holy Ghoſt viſible in fierie tongues, for which cauſe he is ſaid to be mightier then *S. Iohn*, as likewiſe, becauſe he will purge his floore in this life with tribulations, and with the holy Ghoſt (as the Prophet *Malachy* ſaid) and after at the day of Iudgement, gather his wheat into his Granary, & burne vp the chaff with vnquēchable fier; which who ſeeth not, that it ſhall be chiefly at his ſecond comming, and in ſome ſort in euery mans particuler iudgement, but in no wiſe at his firſt comming? And the reſt ſeemeth nothing terrible, except perhappes to the Iewes; but that were without reaſon alſo, ſince they are not made in any worſe eſtate, then they were before, but only other Nations are in better; ſo that their priuiledg is made common with others, or rather inſteed of their particuler priuiledge, they receaue a common benefit greater without compariſon.

Finally *M. Downam* bringeth the propheſy of ould *Symeon Luc*. 2. that our *Sauiour was put to the ruyne, and riſing of many:* and *Rom*. 9. he is called *a ſtumbling ſtone, and a rock of offence; vpon which ſtone whoſoeuer falleth, ſhall be broken in peeces: but vpō whomſoeuer it ſhall fall, it ſhall all to grind him, Matth.* 21. But theſe places are leſſe to the purpoſe thē the reſt, for true it is, many by their owne fault & want of faith came to ruyne by occaſion of Chriſts comming, but this maketh not his comming terrible, no more then any other benefite can be accompted ſo, becauſe the abuſe of it cauſeth harme to the abuſers, & in this ſenſe and no otherwiſe is he called *a ſtumbling ſtone*, or *a rock of offence*, for otherwiſe of it ſelfe, his firſt comming is only *in reſurrectionem*, and *lapis ſummus, angularis, electus, pretioſus*, as *S. Peter* ſpeaketh, and to fall vpon this ſtone, is to be ſcandalized, and not to belieue in Chriſt, which is a great miſery ſignified by *S. Iohn Apoc. cap*. 2. *&* 21. by the firſt death, but

Luc. 2. *Rom*. 9. *Matth*. 21. 1. *Pet*. 2. *Apoc*. 2. *&* 21.

but they vpō whō it falleth taſt likewiſe of the ſecōd death, which is a farre greater miſery, and is to befall them in the ſecond comming of our Lord to iudgemēt as a proper effect of that comming: whereas the other is not the effect of our Sauiours firſt comming, but of mens owne wickedneſſe, by which they are ſaid to fall and ſtumble vpon him, by whom they might haue riſen, if they had taken that benefite by him, which he came to procure them. And thus we ſee that the firſt comming of our B. Sauiour was no way terrible of it ſelfe, but altogeather comfortable and pleaſant; ſo that this great and horrible daie of which the Prophet ſpeaketh, muſt needes be the day of his ſecond comming, which ſhall of it ſelfe, and properlie be terrible, as contayning rather Iuſtice and Iudgement, then Mercy; which onlie was to be found in the firſt, euen towards the wicked themſelues, whome he came not then to iudge, but to call to pennance.

Chriſts firſt comming was not terrible, as his ſecond ſhalbe.

All theſe places of Scripture being thus eaſilie anſwered, it was no meruaile, though *M. Downā* reſted not content, & therfore anſwereth further, *that the Hebrew word* Norah *ſignifieth alſo Reuerend, to be feared, or had in reuerence, as Gen. 28. 17. Deut. 7. 21. and ſo is tranſlated by* Tremelius *and* Iunius *in this place of Malachie. And thus both that word, and others of the ſame roote are vſed in the ſignification of reuerence, or filiall feare.* And he citeth in the margent *pſal.* 13. 4. But *M. Downam* muſt know, that we eſteeme more of *S. Hierome*, and other auncient interpreters, then of his new *Tremelius* and *Iunius*, who we doubt not will fauour their new opinions ſo much as they may, by any colour they can deuiſe. Wherefore ſince the word may ſignifie both *reuerence* and *terrour*, and beſides moſt vſuallie it ſignifieth *terrour*, & particulerlie in this place by the cōſent of all ancient interpreters & Fathers; we ſee no reaſon why we ſhould imbrace this new particuler opinion, but rather take the ſame ſenſe in this place, which is manifeſt, that the ſame words haue *Ioel* 2. except *M. Downā* can ſhew vs, that the *Sun was turned into darkenes, and the Moone into bloud*, before the firſt comming of our Sauiour. Finally there is no doubt, but that the ſecond comming is as full of *reuerence*, and *filiall feare* as the firſt, and conſequently euen

in this sense also were to be called *horible* and *terrible*. Thus much for the 1. proofe, that *Malac.* spake of the secõd cõming.

Cardinall Bellarmine his second proofe is, because it is added, *least perhapps I come, and strike the earth with a curse:* which *M. Downam* applyeth to the first comming, because our Sauiour at his second comming, shall without peraduẽture strike the earth. But he might easily haue bethought himselfe, that at his first comming, without peraduenture, our Sauiour was resolued not to strike the earth with curses, but to repleniſh it with blessings: & this resolution arose not from any merits, or good disposition of any, that liued eyther then, or before, or after: but from his owne infinite mercy and goodnes, by which he vouchsafed to make vs his friends: being of our selues his enemies so vniuersally, that there was not one that could appease his wrath: and I meruayle much, that *M. Downam* should vpon the suddaine, only to auoide an argument, attribute more to merits then euer any Catholike did, wherfore we may well hope, that he wil admit freewill also, without which there is no merit, and which indeed that (*peraduenture*) signifyeth in this place: for in respect of Gods decree and knowledg, there could be no doubt, what he was to do at either comming, but only how we would dispose our selues, which by al probability those, which shall liue at our Sauiours second comming, and aboue others the Iewes, would not do in any good sort; especially hauing then more hinderances, by reason of Antichrists persecution, then euer before; had they not the assistãce of these two holy Prophets *Henoch* and *Helias*.

Downam attributeth more to merits thẽ euer any Catholike did.

Finally the authority of *Arias Montanus* will stand *M. Downam* in very little stead, though he accounteth him the most learned writer among the Papists; for how learned soeuer he was, his priuate exposition plainely both against the exposition of the Fathers, and the text it selfe (as *Bellarmine* hath proued) can haue no great force: and indeed this was the fault of that man, that he trusted more to his owne iudgment, then to the authority of others, which must needes please *M. Downam* well, and we are content to let it passe, so long as he was content to submit all his priuate opinions to the Churches censure, which *M. Downam* will

Arias Montanus

not

not doe; and therfore where the other was ſometime raſh, he is ſtill headlong, that is an heretike: and ſo we admit that *Arias* in a raſhnes fauoured to much ſome of *M. Downās* hereſies. And this ſhall ſuffice for the firſt place of the Prophet *Malachy*.

4. *Bellarmines* ſecond Scripture is the booke of *Eccleſiaſticus*, out of which he alleadgeth two places, the one for *Helias*, and the other for *Henoch*, to which *M. Downam* anſwereth: *Firſt, that although this booke be very commendable, yet it is not of Canonicall authority, being but an humane writing, as appeareth not only by the former place alleadged, but alſo by that erroneous conceipt concerning* Samuel *Chap.* 46. 23. But that this booke is canonicall, he may ſee manifeſtly proued in *Bellarmine l.* 1. *de verbo Dei, cap.* 10. & 14. by the authority of Councells and Fathers. Neither could *Caluin D. Downams* good Maiſter find any obiection againſt this booke in particuler, though he cenſured it more hardely, then *M. Downam* doth. By which we imagine, that it will be an eaſy matter to anſwere to theſe two obiections, which *M. Downam* maketh in this place: and indeed they are plaine fooleries, and therfore no meruaile, though *Caluin* had wit inough to omit them: for what can be more fooliſh, then to deny the authority of Scripture, only becauſe it fauoureth his aduerſary in ſome queſtiõs in cõtrouerſy? Did euer any Heretike deny any part of Scripture, with leſſe reaſon then this? And for the preſent queſtion, I hope the Reader will remayne ſatisfied with that, which ſhalbe ſaid in this Chapter: and for the other of *Samuel cap.* 46. 13. I remit him to that, which *Bellarmine* writeth *lib.* 2. *de Purgatorio cap.* 6. Only I will oppoſe to *M. Downam* the authority of *S. Auguſtine*, who as *Bellarmine* well noteth, hauing bene doubtfull *lib.* 2. *ad Simplicianũ q.* 3. whether *Samuel* himſelfe appeared to *Saul* or no, affirmed without doubt that it was *Samuel*, *lib. de cura pro mortuis cap.* 15. citing the place of *Eccleſiaſticus*, which before he had omitted. *M. Downams* ſecond anſwere is, *that in neither place it is ſaid, that either of them ſhould come to oppoſe himſelfe againſt Antichriſt*. But what then? at leaſtwiſe it is ſaid, *that they ſhall come to appeaſe Gods wrath, and to reconcile the hart of the father to the ſonne, and to reſtore the Tribes of Iſrael*: and of *Henoch*, *to giue pennance to Nations*:

I. VI. Eccleſiaſticus Canonicall Scripture.

Downās *petitio principij*.

all which we learne out of the other places of Scripture, & by the exposition of the Fathers, that it shalbe in the tyme of Antichrist not long before our Sauiours second comming, and consequently that they shall oppose themselues to Antichrist, since he shall striue to drawe both Iewes and Gentills from Christ, and they will labour to conuert them to Christ. And heere I would haue my Reader note one of *M. Downams* ordinary shiftes, to tell vs what the argument doth not proue, omitting directly to answere to that, which it proueth, & for which it is brought. Thirdly he answereth *seuerally* that *Ecclesiasticus* in the first place *wrote, according to the receaued opinion of his tyme*, which in *M. Downams* opinion was false. But surely we haue no reason, to belieue him better then *Ecclesiasticus*, and the Iewes of his tyme, who were no doubt the true people of God; which (whatsoeuer *M. Downam* may perswade himselfe by his speciall Faith) others will greatly doubt of him; and as for our Sauiours, and the Prophet *Malachies* wordes, we haue and shall sufficiently proue, that they were not against *Ecclesiasticus*, nor the receaued opinion of his tyme, as neither against vs, who all agree, that *Elias* in person, and litterally is to come, before the second comming of our Sauiour. And surely *M. Downam* is to bould with *Ecclesiasticus*, and those of his tyme, to attribute vnto them, the errours of those Iewes, which liued in our Sauiours tyme, and were so addicted to this world, that they would by no meanes vnderstand, that their *Messias* was to come in that humility, in which our Sauiour came, which notwithstanding was plainly foretould in the Scriptures which we haue no reason to thinke, but that *Ecclesiasticus*, and those of his tyme did vnderstand aright, and consequently knew well inough, that *Elias* was not to come at our Sauiours first comming, but at his second, since it is manifest in this place, that they expected his comming litterally, and in person. Now as for the authority of *Iansenius*, who *M. Downam* prayseth, as he did before *Arias Montanus*, because he maketh for him, *to be one of the best writers among the Papists*, there had byn no great cause of his commending him, if *M. Downam* had bene disposed to haue dealt sincerely, since *Bellarmine* shewed, how he changed his opinion in *Matth.* 17. where

Downās ordinary shifte.

Eccles. 48.

Downam condemneth Ecclesiasticus & the Iewes of his tyme.

VII. Iansenius

where he writeth that the Prophet *Malachie* cannot be vnderſtood but of the true *Elias*, and conſequently muſt needes thinke, that *Eccleſiaſticus* was not deceaued in vnderſtanding him ſo. But this is another of *M. Downams* tricks, to ſteale an obiection from *Bellarmine*, and omit his anſwere: where we might meruayle at his impudent folly, but that it is no new nor ſtrange thing in him, as it was in *Ianſenius* or any Catholike Writer, to attribute an errour to Canonicall Scripture, which was the cauſe of *Bellarmines* meruayling at *Ianſenius*, and of his changing ſo abſurd an opinion, or rather errour in his later writings, in which he doth not only auouch and prooue this truth, but alſo affirmeth that it is the doctrine of the Catholike Church, which none but an Heretike will deny. Concerning the other place which ſpeaketh of *Henoch*, *M. Downam* triumpheth, ſaying, that *it is a wonder*, *that* Bellarmine *would alleage it for this purpoſe. But that hauing nothing to ſay to the purpoſe, he is deſirous to ſay ſomething to bleare the eyes of the ſimple. The originall text hath*; Henoch *pleaſed the Lord God, and was tranſlated for an example of repentance to the generations*; *that is, that the generations preſent and to come, might be moued by his example to turne vnto the Lord, and to walke before him, knowing by his example, that there is a reward layd vp for thoſe that turne vnto the Lord, and walke before him, as* Henoch *did. But will* Bellarmine *hence conclude, that therfore* Henoch *is to come agayne in the flesh, to oppoſe himſelfe to Antichriſt?*

Downam dealeth not ſincerely taking the obiection & omitting the anſwere

I. VI. *Eccleſiaſt.* 44.

Hitherto *M. Downam*. And this is all he hath to ſay. Where firſt we ſee, that he cannot deny, but that the latin text, which *Bellarmine* cited, made much for this purpoſe: and there is no reaſon, but that we ſhould attribute as much at leaſt, to the latin interpretation, as to *M. Downams* interpretation: ſince it cannot be denyed, but that there is leſſe ſuſpition of partiality in him, being ſo ancient, who made no doubt of the ſenſe, and therfore tranſlated it in that ſorte, as it were to exclude *M. Downams* deuiſe; and ſince the latin Church hath all this tyme receaued this tranſlation for Scripture, we muſt not deny it now, becauſe it is contrary to ſome Proteſtant opinions, eſpecially ſince we ſee far greater difference in other partes of Scripture, betwixt the originall text, & ſome interpretations allowed by the Church: nei-

The latin interpreter not to be reiected.

neither of which the Fathers durſt reiect, but rather imbraced and expounded them both, as the word of God: and indeed who knoweth not, that the chiefeſt certainty, that we haue of either, dependeth vpon the approbation and authority of the Church, which cannot erre in matters of this moment. And I beleiue M. *Downam* will hardly giue vs any other ſufficient reaſon, why he beleieueth theſe bookes to be Scripture, rather then others, or this interpretation to be good, and others bad. But beſides the authority of the latin text, we thinke the Greeke to be for vs alſo, at leaſtwiſe no man can deny, but that our expoſition is conformable to the Fathers doctrine, who affirme our aſſertion of *Henochs* comming, and conſequently we are ſure, that we may ſafely expound it ſo, without danger of errour, and that *M. Downam* hath no reaſon to deny our ſenſe ſo peremptorily, though he thinke his owne better, which we meruayle not at. But further we cannot well ſee, why *Henochs* tranſlation ſhould rather ſerue for an example of Repentance, then of Hope, Religion, Iuſtice, Innocency, Faith, Charity, or any other vertue, if we admitt *M. Downams* expoſition; and yet he is ſaid particularly, to be an example of penuance, which commeth very fitly for the latin interpreter, and our explication, and agreeth paſſing well with that, which *S. Iohn* writeth *Apoc.* 11. that theſe two diuine witneſſes ſhall preach *amicti ſaccis*, in ſack-cloth, which wilbe a good example of pennance indeed.

M. Downams opinion of Henochs trãſlation maketh as much for any other vertue, as for repentance cõtrary to the Scripture.

5. About the third place *Matth.* 17. 11. his firſt anſwere is, that *by the Euangeliſt Marke, who ſpeaketh in the preſent tenſe, Elias indeed, comming firſt reſtoreth all thinges: the meaning of our Sauiour Chriſt, appeareth to haue byn this, Elias quidem venturus fuit primùm, & reſtituturus omnia: Elias indeed was to come firſt, and was to reſtore all thinges.* And you muſt note, that he putteth *S. Markes* wordes, as he citeth them, as alſo his owne interpretation in latin, in a diſtinct character, to bleare the eyes of the ſimple, and make them beleiue, that they are both very Scripture. And ſurely howſoeuer he may excuſe the later, the firſt is ſomewhat hard, ſince that *S. Markes* words are; *Elias cùm venerit primò, reſtituet omnia:* which the Proteſtant Engliſh Bible tranſlateth; *Elias verily when he commeth firſt, reſtoreth*

I. VIII.

Matth. 17. *Mar.* 9.

M. Downam egregiouſly corrupteth S. Marke & S. Matthews Text.

all

all things, where we ſee a (*when*) which ſufficiently ſheweth, that *Elias* was not yet come; and beſides both (*venerit & reſtituet*) are the future, and not the preſent tenſe, and in the wordes following *S. Marke* hath an (*&*) which cleareth this matter greatly, *Sed dico vobis, quia & Elias venit*: *But I ſay vnto you, that Elias is alſo come*, which ſheweth plainely that in the former clauſe our Sauiour ſpake of a future comming, as if he had ſaid, *Elias ſhall come* in perſon, and alſo is come in ſpirit in *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, which only was required at the firſt comming of our Sauiour. But nothing will ſerue headſtrong Heretikes, & therfore *M. Downam* corrupteth *S. Matth.* 11. alſo, making him ſay, *Iohn Baptiſt is that Elias, who was to come*, putting it downe in a diſtinct letter, as before: whereas the wordes are, *Ipſe eſt Elias qui venturus eſt*, where he could ſee the firſt (*eſt*) and tranſlate it truly, but not the ſecond, becauſe it was againſt him. But in this he deſerueth ſome more fauour then before, becauſe he followeth his Proteſtant tranſlation, which hath, *this is Elias, which was for to come*: ſo ſincerely do theſe men tranſlate Scripture. But yet he hath one trick of his owne here alſo, for he addeth the word (*that*) which his Bible hath not, nor the Greek, becauſe he would haue vs thinke, that our Sauiour alluded to the place in *Malachy*, and that *S. Iohn* was that *Elias* there promiſed. But by this we ſee, that all, that *M. Downã* ſaith, is not Scripture, and therfore we are not bound to beleiue him, when he telleth vs, that *Elias* was not promiſed litterally, and that both our Sauiour, and the Angell vnderſtood not the proph- eſy of *Malachy* litterally of *Elias* the *Theſbite*, eſpecially ſince he bringeth no other proofe, but that they vnderſtood it allegorically of *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, which is rather againſt himſelfe ſince that place muſt not only haue an allegorical, but alſo a litterall ſenſe.

Matth. 11.

Malach. 4.

After this he commeth to anſwere *Bellarmines* proofe who inferred by the viſion which the Apoſtles had ſeene a little before of the true *Elias*, that they aſked of him, & conſequently that our Sauiours anſwere is of him alſo. To which *M. Downã* anſwereth, *that it followeth not, for the diſciples ſpake according to the erroneous opinion of the Scribes, who vnderſtanding* Malachy *litterally, thought that* Elias *was to come in his*

Downam condemneth the Apostles, and in some sort our Sauiour himselfe.

owne person, and therevpon (as it is thought) inferred, that Christ was not the true Messias, *because* Elias *came not before him. But Christ &c.* where you see that the Apostles are cõdemned as followers of the erroneous Iewes, as before *Ecclesiasticus*, and the Iewes of his tyme were also: and our Sauiour is beholding to *M. Downam*, that he did him the fauour to let him goe free from this imputation, though he chargeth him also with not answering to the purpose, and not freeing, but rather cõfirming his disciples in their errour, by telling thẽ, *Elias quidem vẽturus est, & restituet omnia. Elias* indeed shall come, and restore all thinges, to wit, as you thinke; for otherwise no doubt, he would haue rather tould them the contrarie, that he was not to come, but was alreadie come: but now he no lesse affirmeth the one then the other. Wherfore if it were true, that *Elias* was come in *S. Iohn Baptist*, it must needes be true also that he was to come in his owne person, as our Sauiour affirmeth, and the Apostles thought, as likewise all other, that will belieue our Sauiour & his Scripture more thẽ thẽselues: out of which nũber we must exclude *M. Downam* and his associates, and then our Sauiour, and his Disciples, and *Ecclesiasticus*, and all other which follow them will agree well inough: for as *S. Hierome* expoundeth their meaning the Apostles did not only speake of *Elias* properlie, but also of the second comming of our Sauiour in glory: Æstimant ergo discipuli &c. (saith hee) *Vvherefore the disciples thinke, that this transformation which they had seene in the mõtayne, was that of glory, and they say, If thou beest now come in glory, why doth not thy forerunner appeare, chiefly because they saw* Elias *was departed*. *Bellarmines* second proofe was, that *S. Iohn Baptist* did not restore all thinges, as our Sauiour affirmeth that *Elias* shall; that is (saith *Bellarmine*) *recall all Iewes and heretikes, and perhappes many Catholikes deceaued by Antichrist, to the true faith*. To which *M. Downam* answereth, that *this doth not agree with the Propheste of our Sauiour Christ, concerning the want of faith at his comming* Luc. 18. 8. *The sonne of mã when he commeth, shall he find Faith vpon earth? But if this conceipt of the Papists were true, there shalbe more true belieuers at the end of the world, thẽ euer had bene at one tyme before.* Thus argueth *M. Downã*. Where first I could wish he had obserued, that *Bellarmine* speaketh not absolutelie of all Iewes

Luc. 18.

and

and heretikes, but only of ſuch as were deceaued by Antichriſt: for many there ſhalbe then, as there are alſo now, that would be incredulous Iewes, & perfidious Heretikes, though Antichriſt had neuer come. And of theſe *Bellarmine* ſpeaketh not, but only houldeth with *S. Auguſtine l.* 1. *Quæſt. Euang. quæſt.* 21. *Quod dixit Dominus: Helias quidem venturus eſt, & reſtituet omnia; id eſt, eos, quos perſecutio Antichriſti conturbauerit.* That which our Lord ſaid, *Elias* indeed ſhall come and reſtore all things, that is, thoſe whome the perſecution of Antichriſt ſhall diſorder. So that now by *M. Downams* confeſſion *S. Auguſtine* entreth into the number of the Papiſts. Wherefore *Bellarmine*, and we all are content to hould our peace, and let him anſwere *M. Downams* argument, as hee doth at large in his booke *de vtilitat. credendi cap.* 15. where this verie place was obiected to him by the *Donatiſts*, who were ſomething a kyn to *M. Downam*, and hee telleth them both, that our Sauiour ſpake thoſe wordes, *vel propter ipſam ſidei perfectionem, quæ ita difficilis eſt in hominibus, vt in ipſis quoque admirabilibus Sanctis, ſicut in ipſo Moyſe inueniatur aliquid vbi trepidauerint, vel trepidare potuerint*: either for the perfection of Faith which is ſo hard for men to haue, that euen in the great & admirable Saintes themſelues, as in Moyſes himſelfe (*Exod.* 20.) there may be ſomething found, where they haue feared or might feare. And then hee giueth a ſecond ſolution, *vel propter illam iniquorum abundantiam, & paucitatem bonorum*: or by reaſon of that aboundance of the wicked, and ſcarcitie of the good. And of this hee addeth an explication, which may ſerue alſo for a third ſolution: *Propterea enim tãquam dubitans hoc Dominus dixit: Neque enim ait, veniens filius hominis, non inueniet fidem in terra, ſed, putas inueniet fidem in terra? Cui vtique cũcta ſcienti, & præſcienti de aliqua re dubitare non conuenit, ſed illius dubitatio noſtram dubitationem figurauit; quia propter multa ſcandala circa finem ſeculi pullulantia, hoc quoque erat quandoq; infirmitas humana dictura.* For this cauſe our Lord ſpake as being in doubt, for he ſaith not, *The ſonne of mã comming ſhall not find faith in the earth*, but, *thinkeſt thou, ſhall he find faith in the earth?* To whome doubtles knowing and foreknowing all thinges, it is not incident to doubt of anie thing, but his doubt ſignified ours, for that by reaſõ of the many ſcandals ariſing towards the end

How Elias ſhall reſtore all thinges.

S. Auguſtine anſwereth Downãs obiection.

Downam omitteth this *putas.*

of the world, the infirmitie of man was at length to vtter these doubtfull wordes. Thus farre *S. Augustine*. So that the conuersion of the deceaued Iewes, and heretikes, may well stand with this doubt, since it is chiefely to be vnderstood in the tyme of Antichrists persecutiõ, which shalbe so great that if God had not prouided this extraordinary helpe of *Enoch* and *Elias*, it might seeme at least to weaklinges vnpossible to preserue the faith in any sort, & much more in that perfect manner, of which our Sauiour speaketh, as *S. Aug.* vnderstandeth him in this place, and *ser.* 36. *de verbis Domini secundum Lucam*; and likewise *S. Hierom. dial. contra Luciferianos cap.* 6. And all this explication is greatly confirmed by the last wordes of the Prophet *Malachy*, where our Lord giueth a reason, why he would send *Elias*, saying: *Ne fortè veniam, & percutiam terram anathemate*: least perhaps I come and strike the earth with a curse, to wit, for the want of Faith, which were likely to be, if *Elias* were not sent.

The necessity of the comming of Enoch & Elias.

The other obiection, which *M. Downam* intrudeth in this place of the vncertainty of our Sauiours comming, belongeth to the next chapter but one, where it shalbe answered. Now it is sufficient to examine that, which is brought in due place, of which sort there remayneth nothing, but *M. Downams* interpretation, how *S. Iohn Baptist* did restore all thinges, to wit *inchoatiuè*, which how vnproperly it is spoken, may easily appeare to any, that will but consider what the wordes (*restituet & omnia*) do import; but to our purpose it is inough, that *Elias* comming before the second comming (in which our Sauiour shall restore all thinges in a much more ample and perfect manner, then he did at his first) may be said also, to restore all thinges much more properly then *S. Iohn* in this manner of *inchoatiuè*, which may also be confirmed by that, which *S. Peter* saith *Act.* 3. that our Sauiour is to remaine in Heauen, *vsque in tempora restitutionis omnium*: vntill the tymes of restoring all thinges, which can by no meanes be vnderstood of his first comming. And thus I would conclude this third place, but that I haue hope that it may be for the good of *M. Downam*, or at least of others as also for the greater glory of this great Doctor of the Church to cite at large the wordes of *S. Aug. tract.* 4. *in Euang. Ioan.*

Ioan. where he excellently explicateth this very place: *In eo Dominus Ieſus Chriſtus &c. Our lord Ieſus Chriſt would prefigure his future comming in S. Iohn Baptiſt, and ſay that S. Iohn was come in the ſpirit of Elias, and that which S. Iohn was at the firſt comming, Elias ſhalbe at the ſecond: as there are two commings of the Iudge, ſo there are two cryers; the ſame Iudge, but two cryers, not two Iudges: & the Iudge was firſt to come to be iudged; he ſent before him his firſt cryer, called him Elias, becauſe Elias ſhalbe that in the ſecond comming, which S. Iohn was in the firſt. For let your Charity conſider how true it is, that I ſay, when S. Iohn was conceaued, or rather when he was borne, the holy Ghoſt propheſied thus of him, and he ſhalbe the forerunner of the higheſt in the ſpirit & vertue of Elias. Then he was not Elias, but in the ſpirit and vertue of Elias. VVhat ſignifyeth, in the ſpirit and vertue of Elias? In the ſame ſpirit, inſteed of Elias. VVhy inſteed of Elias? Becauſe that which Elias ſhalbe in the ſecond comming, S. Iohn was at the firſt. VVherfore rightly S. Iohn anſwered,* Ioan 1. *now properly. For our Lord ſaid Matth. 17. figuratiuely Elias is Iohn, but he (as I ſaid) properly: I am not Elias. If thou conſidereſt the figure of a forerunner, S. Iohn is Elias, for that which he was at the firſt comming, the other ſhalbe at the ſecond. If thou ſeekeſt for the propriety of the perſon, Iohn is Iohn, Elias is Elias: wherfore our Lord for the prefiguration, ſaid rightly, he is Elias, and S. Iohn ſaid rightly for the propriety, I am not Elias &c.* And a little after: *Numquid tu Elias es? Art thou Elias? Now if he ſhould ſay, I am Elias, therefore Chriſt cõming now in his ſecond comming ſhould iudge, and not as yet be iudged in his firſt. As if he had ſaid, Elias is as yet alſo to come: I am not, ſaith hee, Elias: but reſpect him, being humble, before whom Iohn commeth, leaſt you feele him, being high, before whome Elias is to come. For our Lord alſo ended ſo: Iohn Baptiſt is he that it to come. He came in prefiguration, as Elias is to come in propriety. Then Elias ſhalbe Elias by propriety, now S. Iohn was Elias by ſimilitude: Now Iohn is Iohn by propriety, then Elias ſhalbe Iohn by ſimilitude. Both theſe Cryers haue giuen one another their ſimilitudes, and haue kept their proprietyes, but there is one Lord Iudge, whether the one or the other Cryer go before him.* Thus farre *S. Auguſtine*. Where you ſee, he maketh no more doubt, that *Elias* ſhall come, then that *S. Iohn Baptiſt* is come. But he is like to be accompted among the erroneous Iewes, for his labour by *M. Downam*, and *S. Auguſtine* wilbe content to take part with his betters the Apoſtles, as all other that are wiſe will alſo; and let this inſolent Heretike go ſeeke o-

S. Aug. maketh no more doubt that Elias ſhall come, thē that S. Io. Bap. is come.

ther companions like himselfe.

X. XI. XII. 6. Concerning the fourth place, *M. Downam* hauing verie little to say to the purpose, enlargeth himselfe with impertinent discourses, supposing that *Enoch* and *Elias* liue not in mortall bodies, and consequentlie being in Heauen cannot returne into this world to die againe. But let vs see how he proueth this supposition: *If they were not in Heauen, in soule at least* (saith he) *their estate were worse, then of the rest of the faithfull departed, and so their translation should rather haue bene a punishment, then a blessing or prerogatiue vnto them*. And this is all the Scripture or reason he hath for his opinion, against the cõsent of the Church of God and ancyẽt Fathers, who alleage so much, and so plaine Scripture for their assertion. But *M. Downam* shall not need to take any thought for these blessed men, for they thinke their estates happie though it were much worse, then it is, in that they know, that God is most honoured in them so, and his blessed will most perfectlie fulfilled, which they, and all other perfect men esteeme much more of, then of their owne ioy and happines. But least this doctrine should not sinke into the Ministers head, wee may also put him in mind, that it was alway among all people accompted a great happines to liue long in this world, speciallie in good estate, and at ease; and it may be doubted, that if *M. Downam* might be well beneficed to his liking, he would content himselfe to haue this priuiledge, to remaine so, without molestation to the worlds end; for it is not euerie mans case to be so desirous to see God, that they would forthwith forsake all worldly thinges, yea imbrace death it selfe, not to haue this happines differed: for very few so long as they liue in this world, haue their spirituall eyes so cleere, as to haue so great and effectuall a conceyt of Heauen; and those which haue, are of those perfect, who easilie conforme themselues to Gods blessed will in this, & all other things. And heere likewise I might put *M. Downam* in mind, that his great Maister, *Caluin l. 3. Instit. cap. 20. §. 20.* affirmeth, that *only Christ is entred into the Sanctuarie of Heauen, and all other stay without in the Court, and there expect vntill the end of the world.* And §. 24. he saith, *that the soules of the Saintes haue faith still, as we haue*: which being soe, no doubt he must

Apoc. 11.

Enoch and Elias are in Heauen

Caluin thinketh that only Christ is in Heauen & that others stay without.

needes

needes thinke, that they enioy not the viſiō of God, in which our eſſentiall happines conſiſteth. So that in this mans opinion, there is no great difference betwixt *Henoch* and *Elias*, and other Saintes. But I am glad to ſee *M. Downam* leaue his Maiſter in this: would to God he would do ſo in the reſt alſo, that my ioy for him might be complete.

Another trifling obiection of *M. Downam* is, that *S. Iohn* mentioneth *neither Enoch nor Elias*. As though it were not ſufficient that the holie Fathers expound it ſo, and that the circumſtances are ſuch, as that they cannot with anie ſhew of probability, be applied to anie other, which is the reaſon that he himſelfe onlie goeth about to impugne, but dares not take vpon him to defēd his fellow heretikes expoſitiōs, which *Bellarmine* cōfuteth, nor bring any other of his owne. And ſurelie, it is a great wonder, that in the Apocalyps *S. Iohn* ſhould be ſo ouerſeene, as to ſpeake ſo darkelie, that he would leaue out the names of theſe two witneſſes. Fir allie he threatneth *Bellarmine* with another anſwere, ſaying: *But if I ſhould adde, that* Bellarmine *cannot prooue, that this place treateth of Antichriſt, but rather of the Beaſt with ſeauen heades ariſing out of the ſea, that is the Romayne State, either generallie or ſpeciallie vnder the Emperours, as may be gathered by comparing verſe 2. & 7. of the 11. Chap. with the 1. and 5. of the 13. I would then know to what purpoſe he alleadgeth this text to prooue, that* Enoch *and* Elias *ſhall come againſt Antichriſt, if neither the one nor the other be heere meant?* Well Syr, put *Bellarmine* to prooue this, when you will, and you ſhall ſee, how many Authors he will bring you to prooue that both theſe places are to be vnderſtood of Antichriſt: & for the later which you thinke moſt hard, you may take a view of thoſe, which he cited in the former Chapter; where I alſo added a few more. And this proofe ſhall ſuffice for this tyme: for before you and I part, I doubt not, wee ſhall diſcuſſe this matter more fully.

Downam dareth not defend his fellowes.

7. After that *M. Downā* hath thus ſubſtantiallie anſwered *Bellarmines* firſt argument out of the Scripture, he commeth to the Fathers, whom he will ſoone diſpatch, and ſend thē packing; for firſt ſeeing, that they all conſent about the cōming of *Elias*, his āſwere is in plaine wordes to tell thē, *that they were all deceaued*, but yet he doth them ſo much fauour, XIII. XIV. Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

as

as to confesse that they had reason to be so, because they followed *the corrupt translation of the 72. who* Malach. 4. *v.* 5. *reade Elias the Thesbite*: so that now all the fault is layd by *M. Downam* vpon these Interpreters, at which the latin Interpreter of *Ecclesiasticus* hath good cause to reioyce, since by this meanes his case is no worse, then that of these 72. Interpreters, who yet were approued by our Sauiour himselfe, and his Apostles, who were wont to cite the Scripture as they translated it, and all the holy Fathers to expound it also as vndoubted Scripture: and this place in particuler was approued by *S. Hierome* in his traslation of the 70. as also in his Commentaries, and by *S. Cyril*, and *Theodoretus ibidem*, *S. Augustine l. 20. de ciuit. cap.* 22. where he also saith, that the 70. Interpreters *prophetice interpretati sunt*, did interprete as Prophets, and not as bare Interpreters. And *lib.* 18. *cap.* 42. he acknowledgeth in them vniuersally, *mirabilem ac stupendum, planéque diuinum in eorum verbis fuisse consensum*: that there was an admirable, wonderfull, yea manifestly a diuine consent in their wordes. And a little after, *reuerà spiritus erat vnus in omnibus*; verily they had all one spirit, to wit, the spirit of truth, and of prophesy with which the Scriptures were first written, conformably to which *S. Hierome*, *præfat. in Paralip.* acknowledgeth, that the 70. did adde some thinges, *vel ob decoris gratiam, vel ob Spiritus sancti authoritatē*: *either for ornament, or for the authoritate of the Holy Ghost*. But this place in particuler is likewise approued by *Euthymius in Matth.* 17. *& Arethas in Apoc.* 11. and finally by *S. Chrysostom hom.* 58. *in Matth.* where he also saith: *Vides exactam &c. Thou seest the exact diligence of the Prophets prediction, for because S. Iohn might also be called Elias for the likenes of the mystery, to auoyde confusion, he added the Countrey, calling him Elias the Thesbite; for S. Iohn was no Thesbite*. Secondly he saith, that some Authors disagre about *Enochs* comming, in whose place they put either *Elizeus*, or *Moyses*, or *Hieremy*. But what is this to the purpose, since *Bellarmines* argument hath still the same force? For all consent that *Elias* is to come, and as yet he is not come; and besides the common opinion is, that *Enoch* shall come with him, though perhaps it bee not altogeather so certaine of him, as of *Elias*.

Downam reiecteth the 72. Interpreters.

The 72. Interpreters not to be reiected.

Lastly he would make vs beleiue that among all the ancient

cient, which *Bellarmine* citeth, only *S. Gregory is alleadged to the purpoſe*, whoſe authority he reiecteth with a ſcoffe. But this is to ſhew himſelfe in his colours, that is a ridiculous ſcoffing Miniſter. For any man, that hath but morall honeſty cannot chooſe but much condemne this his prophane ſpirit, to contemne this Saintes auctority, becauſe he morally expoũdeth a place of Scripture, with the receaued doctrine of the Church, not prouing it out of that place, but only affirming, that by a morall application, thoſe wordes might haue that ſenſe, which the very title of that whole booke might haue giuen this Miniſter to vnderſtand, if he had either wit in his head or honeſty in his hart. VVell he is content to graunt, that *S. Gregory* was flat for *Bellarmine*. But why doth he deny it of the reſt? Surely it is hard to imagine, ſince their wordes are ſo plaine, and therfore till he giueth vs a reaſon, we may iuſtly thinke, that he hath none, but was willing to delude his Reader, either by ſcoffing or any other lewd trick he could deuiſe, for lightly he could not inuẽt a worſe, then to ſcoffe at Gods Saints, and particularly at thoſe, to whom we are moſt beholding, among which in the firſt place *S. Gregory* is to be accompted, for the great loue he bare to all Engliſh men, and the great good he procured them, for which he is worthily called and honoured, as the Apoſtle of our Nation.

Downam ſcoffeth at S. Gregory.

8. Finally *M. Downam* anſwereth to *Bellarmines* reaſon, *that of Enoch & Elias their tranſlation, there is this reaſon, that there might be euident examples of reward and happines, laid vp both for the vpright in* Enoch, *and for the zealous in* Elias: *of their yet liuing in mortall bodyes, if they did ſo, according to the opinion of ſome of the Fathers, that reaſon might be giuen which they alleadge, to witt, to conuert the Iewes.* Where, in the firſt part I only note, that *M. Downã* maketh *Enoch* an example *for the vpright*, whereas the Scripture maketh him an example of *pẽnance*. But indeed according to this explication, he may (as I noted before) be aſwell an example of the one, as of the other: yea hardly of pennance ſince we read none he did, but rather that he was alway vpright, and iuſt. But now the ſecond reaſon which only maketh to the purpoſe, is the ſame which *Bellarmine* vrgeth, if

XV. Downam maketh Enochs tranſlation an example of vprightnes contrary to Scripture.

if *M. Downam* vnderſtandeth it aright as the Fathers held it, to wit, that theſe two witneſſes ſhall labour to conuert the Iewes, at the end of the world, when *Antichriſt* ſhall moſt labour to peruert them: which wilbe to oppoſe themſelues to him. Wherefore *M. Downam* thought beſt to retire himſelfe, and to tell the Fathers flatlie, that it is *vntrue* (which they ſay) *that they liue in mortall bodies, or that they ſhall euer dye*: and he offereth to diſpute this matter with them. And firſt he asketh them *where they liue in mortall bodies*? To which *S. Auguſtine, lib. 2. de peccato originali, cap. 23.* anſwereth, *That this is one of thoſe queſtions which pertayne not to Faith, where Enoch & Elias are*, quos tamen non dubitamus, in quibus nati ſunt, corporibus viuere: *whome notwithſtanding wee doubt not to liue in the bodies in which they were borne.* By which oppoſitiō he plainly declareth that he taketh this to be a matter of Faith. And in the ſame place he teſtifieth that *Chriſtian faith doubteth not, but that the paradiſe where Adam was placed, is*; though it be doubtfull wher or in what maner it is; all which is alleadged by *Bellar. lib. de gratia primi hominis, cap. 14.* to proue that paradiſe is yet extant; but I cānot find that diſtinction which *M. Downam* bringeth out of him *lib. 1. de Sanct. beat. c. 3. that although the place remaine, yet no paradiſe remaineth*, & in the former place he ſeemeth to teath altogeather the contray

XVI.

Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

S. Auguſtine anſwereth to Downās obiection.

Secondly, if they *be in the earthly paradiſe*, and not in heauen, he aſketh *how it is ſaid of Elias, that hee was taken vp into Heauen*. To which demaund *S. Gregorie* will anſwere him, if he may be ſo bould *Hom. 29. in Euang. Aliud eſt cælum aëreū, aliud æthereum &c. vnde & aues cæli dicimus &c. In cælum itaque aëreum Elias ſubleuatus eſt, vt in ſecretam quandam terræ regionem repentè duceretur, vbi cum magna iam carnis & ſpiritus quiete viueret, quouſque ad finem mundi redeat, & mortis debitum ſoluat. Ille etenim mortem diſtulit, non euaſit.* The ayre is alſo called Heauen, for which cauſe we ſay the byrdes of heauen (according to the phraſe of Scripture) and into this heauen was *Elias* taken vp, that he might forthwith be carried into a certaine ſecret Region of the earth, where he might lyue in great quiet of bodie and mind, till he returneth at the end of the world, and payeth death his due: for he hath deferred not eſcaped death. Where alſo *M. Downam* may learne, what priuiledge

S. Gregorie āſwereth another.

Enoch

Enoch and *Helias* haue aboue others, and how *Enoch* was ſaid to haue byn tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death, to wit, at that tyme, nor according to the courſe of nature: thē which a great deale leſſe is ſufficient, that one hath eſcaped death. Andif *M. Downā* be capable of ſo high and perfect doctrine heere hee may be tould, that *Enoch* and *Helias* thinke it no miſery, but an exceeding great happyneſſe that they ſhalbe put to death by Antichriſt, by reaſon of the great deſire they haueto doe and ſuffer whatſoeuer for the loue of God, and this not for the reward which they expect at his hand, but becauſe he deſerueth much more, then we are able to performe. *Heb.* 11.

A great happineſſe to be put to death by Anticriſt.

9. But I will conclude, leauing the indifferent Reader to iudge whether it hath not byn ſufficiently proued, that *Enoch* & *Elias* are ſtill in their bodies, and that their bodies are mortall, & that they are to returne into the world and die, and that in the tyme of Antichriſt, to oppoſe themſelues againſt him, and conſequentlie, that Antichriſt is not yet come, which if he iudgeth to be ſo; as I perſwade myſelfe he cānot otherwiſe chooſe, I will alſo craue him to giue his verdict of *M. Downam*, whether he thinke him more fooliſh, or impudent to deny all theſe particularyties with this flouriſhing bragge; *Muſt not this needes be a good cauſe; that by ſo learned a man is ſo ſtoutlie prooued?*

Downās bragging.

THE SEAVENTH CHAPTER.

Conteyning the fourth demonſtration.

I. « THE fourth demonſtratiō *(ſaith Bellarmine)* is taken frō Antichriſts perſecution, which certainely will be moſt grieuous and manifeſt, ſo that all publique cerimonies, and ſacrifices of Religion ſhall ceaſe: none of which thinges wee ſee hitherto. That this perſecution ſhalbe moſt grieuious, is manifeſt by *Matth.* 24.. *Then there ſhalbe a great Tribulation the like wherof hath not bene from the beginning of the world, nor ſhall be.* And *Apoc.* 20. where we reade, that Sathan ſhalbe then looſed, who vntill that tyme was bound.

II. « Of which place *S. Auguſtine* diſputing *l.* 20. *de Ciuitate Dei cap.* 8. and 9. ſaith, that in Antichriſts tyme the Diuell is to be looſed, and therfore that perſecution ſhalbe more grieuous, then all the former, by how much the Diuel can rage more cruelly being looſed, then being bound. Wherfore he ſaith, that the Diuell then ſhall vexe the Church with al his owne & his followers forces, and *S. Hippolytus Mart. in orat. de mundi conſum.* & *S. Cyril catecheſi* 15. do ſay, that the Martyrs which Antichriſt ſhall put to death, ſhalbe more renowned, then all thoſe, which went before: becauſe they fought againſt men the diuells miniſters, but theſe ſhall fight againſt the

the Diuell himſelfe, perſecuting in his owne perſon. But certainely we haue experienced no ſuch thing from the yeare 600. or 1000..

The Heretikes indeed ſay, that they ſuffer great perſecution by Antichriſt, becauſe ſometime ſome of their number are burnt: but what compariſon is there, betwixt ſuch a perſecution, and that of *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Decius*, *Diocleſian*, and others, ſince that for one heretike which is burnt, there were in times paſt a thouſand Chriſtians put to death, and that in the whole Roman Empire, not in one only Prouince, & wheras now the greateſt puniſhmēt is to be burnt, then there were incredible, and innumerable torments, of which ſee *Cornelius Tacitus in Nerone*, and *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory. III.

S. Damaſus in the life of *S. Marcellinus* writeth, that there were aboue 17. thouſād Chriſtiās put to death by *Diocleſiā*: & *Euſebius* who liued at that tyme writeth *lib.* 8. *cap.* 6. *hiſt.* that al priſōs were ſo full of Martyrs, that there was no place for offenders; and in all that booke he affirmeth that there were ſo many put to death within the ſpace of two yeares, that it is impoſſible to number them. Beſides the heretikes of our tymes haue put to death more Catholikes within theſe 20. or 30. yeares, in *France* and *Flanders*, then the Inquiſitors haue burnt heretikes perhaps theſe hundred yeares. Wherfore they cannot call this a perſecution, but rather a ciuill warre, for as *S. Auguſtine* teacheth *ep.* 80. *ad Heſychium*, when the true perſecution of Antichriſt ſhall come, only the children of the Church ſhalbe in tribulation, and not their perſecutours, as in the tyme of *Diocleſian*, and the former Princes, only Chriſtians were perſecuted, but did not perſecute againe. IV.

And if this be to be called a perſecution, rather Catholikes ſuffer it, then *Lutherans* and *Caluiniſts*: for Catholikes are caſt out of many Prouinces, and haue loſt their Churches, their Inheritance, and their Country it ſelfe, theſe new Miniſters of this Ghoſpell intruding themſelues into other mens poſſeſſions: and as we ſaid, & may be ſeene in the Commentaryes of *Laurence Surius*, and other Hiſtoriographers of our tyme, the fury of *Caluiniſts* conſumed more Catho- V.

« tholikes in few yeares, then there haue bene Heretikes punished, by the iudgement of Catholike Princes for denying their Faith.

VI. « Now that the persecution of Antichrist, shalbe most manifest and knowne, *S. Aug.* proueth *lib. 20. de ciuitate Dei cap.* « 11. out of those wordes of the *Apoc. 20. And they compassed the tents of the Saintes, and the beloued Citty*: for by these wordes, it « is signified, that all the wicked shalbe togeather in Antichrists army, and shall with open warre impuge all the « Church of Saintes: for now there are many faigned in the « Church, which hiding their malice, are in hart out of « the Church, and in it only in bodie. But thē all shall break « forth (sayth *S. Augustine*) into open persecution, out of « their lurking corners of hatred. This surely is so farre of « from being fulfilled at this tyme, that there was neuer almost a greater number of false brethren, and faygned Christians, and this persecution is so farre of from being knowne « and manifest, that neither they which say they suffer it, « nor wee that are said to cause it, can tell whē it began.

VII. « Certainly the persecutiōs of *Nero, Domitiā*, & other *Romā* « *Princes*, were diligently noted by *Eusebius, Orosius, Sulpitius*, & « there is no doubt whē they began, & whē they ended, as « likewise the comming of Christ, because it was true & manifest, we know verie well when it was, and to whome « first manifested, and there is no diuersitie of opinions among vs, concerning this matter. But the heretikes, which « say, that Antichrist is come, and hath persecuted so long, « cannot produce one author, who hath noted the tyme, whē « Antichrist came, or to whome he first appeared, or when « he began his persecution; and they disagree so among themselues, that one saith he came in the yeare 200. another in « the yeare 606. another in the yeare 773. another in the « yeare 1000. another 1200. So that they seeme rather to dreame in their sleepe, then to speake waking.

VIII. « Finallie that in Antichrists tyme the publique and dailie office, and Sacrifice of the Church shall cease, by reason « of the greatnes of the persecution, *Daniel* plainely teacheth « *cap. 12. from the tyme that the continuall Sacrifice shalbe taken away,* « *M. CC. XC. dayes*: where by the consent of all, he speaketh

of

of Antichriſts tyme, and as *S. Irenæus lib* 5. *S. Hierome*, and *Theodoretus* vpon that place, *S. Hippolytus Martyr in orat. de conſũmatione mundi*, and *Primaſius in cap.* 11. *Apoc.* expound it, the ſenſe is, that Antichriſt ſhall forbid all the diuine worſhip, which is now exerciſed in the Chriſtian Churches, and eſpeciallie the holie Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, but that this ſigne is not yet fulfilled, experience teacheth.

Out of which three thinges may be gathered. Firſt that Antichriſt is not yet come, ſince the continuall Sacrifice is ſtill in vſe. Secondlie, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is not Antichriſt, but moſt contrarie to him, ſince he doth chiefly adorne and defend the Sacrifice, which Antichriſt ſhall take away. Thirdlie, that the heretikes of this tyme aboue all others are the forerunners of Antichriſt; ſince they wiſh nothing more earneſtly, then vtterly to aboliſh the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt. IX.

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downam* verie courteouſly admitteth that Antichriſts perſecution was *to be verie grieuous*; but alloweth not of *Bellarmines* proofes, affirming that the great tribulation which our Sauiour ſpeaketh of *Matth.* 24. is no other, then *the calamyties which at the deſtruction of Hieruſalem by the Romans the Iewes ſuſteyned*; which how true it is, may be ſufficiently ſeene by that which hath bene ſaid in the 4. chapter. Now it is ſufficient that we agree in the cõcluſion. I. II. The perſecution of Antichriſt moſt grieuous.

2. Wherefore all his long diſcourſe about the thouſand yeares *Apoc.* 20. is altogeather impertinent, and fooliſh alſo, in that he vnderſtandeth thoſe 1000. yeares definitely, which indefinitely ſignify all the yeares and ſpace from Chriſts Paſſion, when the Deuill was bound, vntill Antichriſts time, when he ſhall be looſed; and it is falſe, that any were put to death, by the chiefe Antichriſt within thoſe thouſand yeares. For how could that be, ſince he was not to come, before they were expired, as all but Heretikes agree? But all this, as alſo the queſtion of *Gog* and *Magog*, is from The 1000. yeares Apoc. 20. are to be takẽ indefinitely.

from the preſent purpoſe, which *M. Downã* could not chooſe but ſee, though he were content to caſt this miſt before the Readers eyes that he might not ſee the force of *Bellarmines* argument, which conſiſteth in this, that the perſecution of Antichriſt is to be moſt grieuous, which he is content to graunt, becauſe he cannot deny it, & would help to prooue it alſo, though verie ſimplie, God wot; but wee will accept his good will, ſince his meaning ſeemeth to be only to confirme *Bellarmines* aſſertion, which wee onlie requeſt him to graunt: though wee would not haue him afraid to thinke, that the perſecution vnder Antichriſt ſhalbe greater then the calamities of the Iewes, ſinèe the ſame wordes are vnderſtood of both, and that of the Iewes was but a figure in compariſon of the other. Wherfore *Dan.* alſo *cap.* 12. writeth, *that this ſhalbe ſuch a tyme, as hath not bene, ſince the Nations began to be.* And ſurely no perſecutiõ can be greater, thẽ that in which the Diuell ſhall vſe the vttermoſt of his owne, & all his followers forces, as *S. Auguſtine* affirmeth he ſhall in this, being then looſed from his long impriſonment, as *S. Iohn* affirmeth, whatſoeuer *M. Downam* imagineth.

The perſecution of Antichriſt ſhalbe greater then the calamities of the Iewes.

3. Well this ſuppoſed, *M. Downam* will needes make vs beliue that this great perſecution hath bene made by the Popes, againſt men of his Religion: and firſt he is fayne to tell vs of the Popes ſpirituall perſecution, *wherin* (ſaith he) *he taketh ſuch liberty to himſelfe; that if he carry whole troupes of ſoules into hell, no man may ſay vnto him, Syr why do you ſo?* But this is a ſhameles lye, eſpecially now that it hath bene ſo fully diſcouered by the author of the *VVarn-word* againſt *Syr Frauncis Haſtings* and *O. E.* otherwiſe *M. Sutcliffe*, who patched vp a lie out of two places of the Canon law, wherof one had no cõnextion at all with the other, as that Author at large declareth, who likewiſe telleth him where, and when ſome Catholikes were bayted by dogges in beares ſkins, which to him is ſuch great newes.

III. IV.

A ſhameles lye.

Encount. 2. cap. 13. n. 16.

Ibid. cap. 2. n. 4.

4. And beſides, this allegation of ſpirituall perſecution is from the purpoſe, and a fault by ſome called *petitio principij*, becauſe all Catholikes count it a great bleſſing, and no perſecution at all. Secondly he goeth into *France* for Martyrs, where he taketh into his accoumpt the *Albigenſes* &

Downãs *petitio principij*

VVal-

Vvaldenses, & ioyneth the with his *Hagenots*, & so he may wel inough, for they be Martyrs alalike, to wit, of the Diuell, since they were al Heretiks, though of diuers sects, as he may be fully instructed by the same Author I mentioned before, in his Treatise of *Fox his Calender-Martyrs*. And yet *M. Downam* shall not find so many Martyrs of these neither, except he will number them who were miraculously slaine in lawful warre by *Symon Momford* the Earle of *Leicester* & after of *Tolosa*, which were plaine rebells against their King & Countrey. And *Iohn Fox* could only find 13. of these two sects, which he thought worth the putting into his Kalender, as the same Author sheweth, & euery man may see in *Fox* himselfe. part. 1. cap. 3.

After *France* he commeth into the *Low-Countries*, & there nubreth 36000. *which the Duke of Alba caused to be executed*, which how many soeuer they were, as al the world knoweth, were open rebells, as likewise those 40000. if they were so many, killed in the Massacre at *Paris*. But *M. Downams* religion hath this vertue in it, that houlding but one or some few pointes of it, a man may safely dye for any other heresy, or crime, & yet by his fellow *Hugonots* be accompted a Martyr. Lastly he citeth *Vergerius* and in the margent quoteth *Io. Bale de act. Pontif.* who witnesseth, that *within the space of 30. yeares, there were put to diuers fearfull deathes, by the bloudy Inquisition, an hundreth and fifty thousand Christians*. But we must haue better proofes, then only the testimonie of two most violent, and lying heretikes, before we believe this: and besides it were necessary for *M. Downam* to proue, that all those Christians were of his religion, which wilbe very hard for him to do, since that these his Authors affirme no such matter. Downās Martyrs, Heretikes & Rebels

5. But why doth not *M. Downam* answere to *Bellarmine*, who telleth him, that all this persecution is but a ciuill warre, since Protestants put Catholikes to death, as well as they do Protestants; and *S. Augustine* telleth vs, that in Antichrists persecution, only the children of the Church shalbe in Tribulation, and not their persecutors. The cause of this was, because he saw there was no shew of answere to be made, and therfore he thought it best to passe it ouer in silence, hoping that the Reader would not take the paines to looke vpon *Bellarmine*, nor any other to discouer his fol- V. Downam flieth the difficulty.

lies, for he cannot deny, but that Catholikes haue bene persecuted by Protestats, & yet he would fayne diminish these persecutions against Catholikes by his brethren; & first hee auoucheth plainly, *that the warres which haue bene vndertaken by the Hugonots in France and Flanders for their owne defence, that they might be free from their Princes outrages, were lawfull battailes*: euen as when the *Machabees* resisted *Antiochus* and other Tyrants. So that you see open rebellion and treason mainteyned for lawfull by this new Ghospeller, which defence notwithstanding cannot comprehend the manifold murthers of Priests, Religious and others which these Hugonots committed in cold bloud, & out of battaile, of which *M. Downã* could not be ignorant. But let vs see, what he saith of our English persecution, for he is not afraid forthwith to charge all Priests and Catholikes put to death in our Countrey, of treason, and to complaine greatlie of the fauour which the Prince in some sort hath vsed to them in durance; so cruell and bloudie a mynd carrieth this Minister with him, being not ashamed to affirme, that the life of the prisoners in *Wisbich* & *Framingham*, hath bene more easie and pleasant, and mayntenance more plentifull, then of the Students and ministers of his crew; which all wise men will easilie laugh at, except he should speake of spirituall and heauenlie comfortes, which this poore Minister neuer tasted of: for other ease, pleasure, or maintenance, it were hard for them to haue, liuing in prison, and often in chaines, & hauing no other maintenance, then the almes of poore Catholikes, many of them being so impouerished with oppressions for their conscience, that they should scarce be able to mainteyne themselues, and their families, were they not content to liue within their compasse, and vnder their degrees, whilst a sort of marryed Ministers feed vpon their substance; which is another kind of persecution which *Bellarmine* vrgeth, and *M. Downã* passeth ouer in silence, to wit to be cast out of their Churches, and Church-lyuings, Vniuersities, and the like, which were instituted for Catholikes by their Ancestors, and are now vsurped by Protestãts, altogeather against the Founders will & intention: and the like is of the Inheritances in some, and of their Coun-

Downam mayntey-neth open Rebellion & treasõ.

The persecutiõ of Catholikes in England.

trey

trey in many. And this shall suffice for these persecutions or rather the cyuill wars of this tyme betwixt Catholikes & Heretiks: only I could wish my Reader to reflect a little vpō the Christiā Princes, in whose dominiōs at this daie there is diuersity of Religions, & he shall find, that all the Catholike Princes tolerate in some sort their Hereticall subiects, as the Emperour, the King of *France*, the King of *Poland*, & now the Arch-duke in *Flanders*, whereas heere in *England* the Catholikes can find no such fauour, who, that they suffer for Religion, and not for treason none but impudent Ministers and their mates can deny.

The difference betwixt the Catholike & the Protestāt Princes.

Neither is this craft of Protestāts any great glory for thē, who by reasō of the distrust which they haue in their owne cause, vse to put Catholiks to death vnder the name of Treason, though they can prooue nothing against them, but the exercise of their Religion. For in this they imitate the Iewes who dealt so with our Sauiour, and some other Tyrants, but chiefly *Iulian* the Apostata, which were alway accompted the greatest and worst persecutors. Whereas Catholikes haue alway punished heretikes directely for their heresie, esteeming it (as it deserued) a far greater crime then treason, as being cōmitted against the King of Heauē, whō all earthly Princes are boūd to respect more then thēselues, & so wee see in Queene *Maries* tyme, Bishop *Cranmer* had his Treasons pardoned, but not his heresies, for which hee was burned. And so it appeareth by the proceeding of our aduersaries that wee are free frō heresie: & how false their imputations of treasons are, is proued by many, and lastely by W. R. in his Cōfutatiō of *O. E. aliàs Sutcliffes* vaunting challeng, in the last chapter, to which I remit my reader. And this shall suffice for the greatnes of the persecution vnder Antichrist.

Catholikes are put to death for Religion by Protestants.

6. Touching the manifestnes of it, *M. Downam* is not of *Bellarmines* mynd, yea he thinketh his doctrine *contrary to our Sauiours, who hath said, that the good and bad shall grow together like wheat and tares, vntill the day of the great harueſt*. But *M. Downam* may vnderstand, that *Bellarmine* houldeth with *S. Augustine quæſt.* 11. *super Matth.* that this is to be vnderstood of the whole world, in which *Bellarmine* denieth not, but there wilbe store of tares in this tyme of Antichrist; and besides

VI. VII. Antichrists persecutiō most manifest. *Matth.* 13.

sides our Sauiour only willeth his seruants not to roote out all the tares, when there is danger, that the corne may also be destroyed by that meanes. But now we speak of his enemies who partly by persecuting, partly for feare of persecution will separate themselues of their owne accord, from among Gods wheate, to wit, his elect; and yet are to bee separated also in the day of Iudgment against their wills, which is all that the place alleadged doth proue.

Downam reiecteth S. Augustine

To the authority of *S. Augustine* alleadged by *Bellarmine* he giueth two answeres. First, *if he had said so, we might haue esteemed his speach to haue bene but a human coniecture, rather then a prophesy diuine*: so that it is no matter, what *S. Augustine*, or any other can say. For if it please not *M. Downams* vaine fancy, it shall be accompted but an humane coniecture, though he gather it out of Scripture, as *S. Augustine* doth this. But secondly, saith *M. Downam*, *Bellarmine without all shame falsifieth his wordes, who speaketh of the Diuell alone, and not of all the wicked, saying: Now it is said, that he shall goe forth, viz. into open persecution: he shall breake forth of the couerts of hatred*: for which we must note, that *S. Augustine* interpreteth the depth into which the Diuell was put, to be their hartes which

Bellarmin vniustly charged by M. Downam

hate the Christians, *in quorum* (saith he) *quotidie velut in abysso, cæcis & profundis cordibus includitur. cap. 8. In whose blind and profound hartes, he is daily incloſed, as in a depth.* Which exposition he mentioneth againe *cap.* 11. which *Bellarmine* cited, where he expoundeth, how he is said to come forth out of this depth, to wit, out of the couerts of hatred, within which he was incloſed, into open persecution, becauſe he shall seduce thoſe, whoſe harts he poſſeſſed to make warre against Christians, which before he hated, but was not permitted to hurt; all which, that he meaneth of all the wicked, the wordes following immediately declare. *Hæc enim erit nouiſſima perſecutio nouiſſimo imminente iudicio, cùm ſãcta Eccleſia toto terrarum orbe patietur, vniuerſa ſcilicet ciuitas Chriſti ab vniuerſa Diaboli ciuitate, quantacumque erit vtraque ſuper terram.* For this shalbe the laſt perſecution, the laſt iudgment being at hand, which the holy Church shall suffer ouer all the world, to wit, the whole citty of Christ, by the whole citty of the Diuell, how great soeuer either of them shallbe

vpon

vpon the earth. Can any thing be more plaine then this? And after againe he saith, that the holy Church shal be enuironed *abominibus inimicis suis, by all her enemies*: yea he repeateth the very like wordes to those, which he had spoken in the singular number, againe in the plurall, speaking of the Nations, *quæ sunt in quatuor angulis terræ*, in the foure corners or quarters of the earth, *in apertum odium de occulto eruptura sunt*: they shal breake forth into open hatred of their hidden malice. Wherfore let any man iudge, whether *Bellarmine* changed *S. Augustines* sense, though for brenity and perspicuities sake he cited his wordes in the plurall number, as they were to be vnderstood, & are repeated also by *S. Augustine* himselfe.

All the Churches enemies shal ioyne to impugne her in Antichrists tyme.

7. Now, that al that hate Christians or the Church, haue not hitherto ioyned against them, is so manifest, that *M. Downam* cannot deny, and therfore granting it, he only turneth to aske: *whether they shall do so when Antichrist commeth or no?* To whome we returne answere, that they shall, as hath bene sufficiently proued, and therfore it is manifest, that Antichrist is not yet come. To the second part of *Bellarmines* proofe he answereth, that the vncertainty of the beginning of Antichrists persecution, *if it were true, doth not disproue the greatnes: but argueth the length*. As though now we treated of the greatnes, and not of the manifestnes of this persecution, which surely is plainly disproued, if it were so secret, that no man can tell when it began. Secondly he saith, *the persecutions vnder* Nero *& the rest*, were wel knowne when they began, and when they ended, *because there was some intermission of them*, but these now, *haue no end, nor yet intermission, except it be when they haue none to persecute*. And is not this a wise answere thinke you, to tell vs that the beginning of a persecution cannot be shewed, because it hath no intermission, nor end? Except he would haue vs to vnderstand him, that he meaneth, that it hath had no beginning: neither to which we likewise willingly agree, for the tyme was, and that within these hundred yeares when there was no Protestant in the world to persecute, so that this is an inuisible persecution of an inuisible Congregation, which he maketh so much adoe about, and will needes haue it to be the great persecution of Antichrist. Finally he would willingly bring

VII.

Downam forgetteth what he impugneth.

An inuisible persecution of an inuisible Congregation

his brethren to an agreement, about the time of Antichrists comming, but he laboureth in vaine, and bringeth nothing, but that which is already confuted in the third chapter. Wherfore it remayneth cleere and manifest, that the persecution of Antichrist is not yet come.

VIII. The publike & daily office and Sacrifice of the Church, shall cease in Antichrists tyme.

8. The third part of this Demonstration was, that in the tyme of Antichrists persecution, the publike and daily office, and sacrifice of the Church shall cease, which *M. Downam* denieth flatly, but yet would seeme to moderate it, by adding, that at least it shall not be so *at his first cõming*: & thẽ setteth downe certayne degrees inuented by himselfe of Antichrists appearing, which so far as they make any way against vs, haue and shalbe sufficiently confuted. But now wee must intreat *M. Downam* not to go from the difficultie, but to answere directly to *Bellarmines* argumẽt, takẽ out of an expresse place of Scripture, ioyned with the exposition of the Fathers, whome hee easily reiecteth in few wordes saying, *that hee needeth not runne with Bellarmine to the Fathers, for the exposition of this place*: but I am afraid wee shall find him running to worse men, who will leade him into most absurd errours; for that is most true, which *S. Hierome* writeth in the end of *Dan.* 11. hauing learnedly confuted *M. Downãs* chief Captaine in the exposition of this whole place, which wee haue now in hand. *Hoc ideo prolixiùs posui* (saith he) vt & Prophyrij ostendam calumniam (qui hæc omnia ignorauit, aut nescire se finxit) & Scripturæ sanctæ difficultatem, cuius intelligentiam absque Dei gratia & doctrina maiorum sibi imperitissimè vel maximè vendicant. *I haue put downe thus the more at large, both to shew* Prophyries *calumny (who either was ignorant of these thinges, or faygned that he knew thẽ not) & also the difficultie of holy Scripture, the vnderstanding of which the most vnskillfull aboue all others, challeng to themselues without Gods grace, and their Ancestors learning.* And may not *M. Downam* be ashamed to defẽd this very calumny, and to shew himselfe, as ignorant, or malicious as wicked *Prophyrie* himselfe? and consequently to be without Gods grace, which *S. Hierome* ioyneth with the learning of our elders, whome *M. Downam* professeth to set litle by; and so by *S. Hieromes* iudgement is a graceles, impudent, & most vnlearned heretike. And will any man be so mad,

Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

The difficultie of the Scripture, & why many erre in the interpretation thereof.

mad, as to aduenture his saluation vpon the conduct of such blind guides?

But yet let vs discouer his follie more fully, that if it be possible, he may by shame be brought to leaue it, or at least others which are not so farre ingaged, may see it, and abhore it. Wherefore *S. Hierome* in the same 11. Chapter vpon those wordes: *Et faciet iuxta voluntatem suam Rex &c.* *Dan.* 11. sheweth, that now not onlie all Christians, but euen the very Iewes themselues, who before had their particuler interpretations, agreed, that from that place the Prophet was to be vnderstood of Antichrist. *Ab hoc loco* (saith he) *Iudai de Antichristo dici putant.* And a little after: *Quod quidem & nos de Antichristo intelligimus, Prophyrium autem, & cæteri qui sequuntur eum, de Antiocho Epiphane dici arbitrantur.* From this place the Iewes thinke, that Antichrist is spoken of; which truly we also vnderstand of Antichrist: but *Prophyrie* and those which follow him (among whome *M. Downam* will needes make one) suppose it to be spoken of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. But comming to the 12. Chap. out of which *Bellarmine* alleadged his testimony, *S. Hierome* writeth thus: *Hactenus Prophyrius vtcunque se tenuit, & tam nostrorum imperitis, quàm suorum malè eruditis imposuit. De hoc capitulo, quid dicturus est, in quo mortuorum describitur resurrectio, alijs suscitatis in vitam æternam, & alijs in opprobrium sempiternum? Nec potest dicere, qui fuerint sub Antiocho fulgentes quasi splendor firmamenti, & alij quasi stella in perpetuas æternitates. Sed quid non facit pertinacia? Quasi contritus coluber eleuat caput, & morituru in eos, qui morturi sunt, venena diffundit.* Hitherto in some sort *Prophyrie* hath defended himselfe, and deceaued aswell the vnlearned among vs, as the euill learned among them. What will hee say of this Chapter, in which the resurrectiō of the dead is described, some being raised to life euerlasting, others to euerlasting reproach? Neither can he tell vs, who vnder *Antiochus* they were that shined, as the brightenes of the firmament, and others as starres for euerlasting eternities. But what doth not pertinacie? She listeth vp her head like a bruised snake, & dying spitteth out her venom vpon them which are likewise to dy. And will *M. Downam* ioyne with *Prophyrie* in his pertinacie? Will he needes be one of these bruised-dying-snakes, and still continue

Dan. 12.

Downam followeth Prophyry an Anpostata, against both Christians and Iewes.

Downās and Prophyries pertinacy.

to

to spit out his heretical, & perfidious poison? If he be thus obstinate, yet I beseech my Readers, yea all my Countreymen to fly from him, least he kill them with his venemous tongue. For if they will not approach too neere, they may perhaps heare him hisse like a goose, but sting them he cannot.

But let vs heare what *S. Hierome* writeth vpon the very words which *Bellarmine* citeth: *Hos mille ducentos nonaginta dies Porphyrius in tempore Antiochi, & in desolatione Templi dicit completos, quam & Iosephus & Machabeorum liber tribus tantùm annis fuisse commemorat. Ex quo perspicuum est tres istos, & semis annos de Antichristi dici temporibus, qui tribus & semis annis, hoc est, mille ducentis nonaginta diebus Sanctos persecuturus est. Postea conteritur in monte inclyto & sancto. A tempore igitur τῆς ἀθεμιτότητος (quod nos interpretati sumus, Ingens sacrificium) quando Antichristus orbem obtinens, Dei cultum interdixerit vsque ad interfectionem eius, tres & semis anni, id est, mille ducenti & nonaginta dies complebuntur.* These thousand two hundreth and ninetie daies *Porphyrie* saith were fulfilled in the tyme of *Antiochus*, and in the desolation of the Temple, which both *Iosephus* and the booke of the *Machabees* mention to haue bene only three yeares. By which it is manifest, that these three yeares and a halfe are spoken of Antichrists tymes, who shal persecute the Saints three yeares and a halfe, that is, a thousand two hundreth ninety daies, and after shall perish in the famous and holy Mount Syne. From the tyme therfore ἐρημώσεως, which we haue trãslated, the cõtinuall sacrifice, whẽ Antichrist cõquering the world, shal forbid the worship of God, vntill his destructiõ, three yeares & a halfe, that is, a thousand two hundreth and nynety dayes. Thus farre *S. Hierome*: where we haue not only his opinion, but also his proofes, euen out of the conference with scripture, which *M. Downam* appealeth vnto: but perhaps he meaneth only if we giue him leaue to choose the places, & make the conference himself. But we must know him better before we giue him so much liberty, except it be reserued the like to our selues, so that after we haue heard what he can say, we may confer it with other surer principles then his expositions are, and only admit of that which we find agreable to them. And vpon this condition we will see how well he conferreth in this

S. Hierom confuteth Porphiry and Downam

this place. First then he conferreth this place with Chapter 7. where he saith, that the *tyme from the interruption of Gods seruice, to the first restitution thereof by* Iudas Machabæus, *which was three yeares and ten dayes, namely from the 15. of the moneth* Casleu *in the 145. yeare of the* Seleucidæ 1. Machab. 1. 57. *vnto the 25. of the moneth of* Casleu *in the yeare 148.* 1. Machab. 4. 52. *is called by* Daniel *a tyme, and tymes, and partell of a tyme.* But now wee returne to the same difficulty: wherfore not to be too tedious, remitting my Reader for the rest to that, which hath byn said about this 7. Chapter of *Daniel* in the 5. Chapter, I will only recyte *S. Hieromes* vpon these very words in controuersy. *Tempus annũ significat* (saith he) *tempora iuxta Hæbraici sermonis proprietatem, qui & ipsi dualem numerum habent, duos ãnos præfigurant; dimidium autem temporis sex menses, quibus Sancti potestati Antichristi permittendi sunt, vt condemnentur Iudæi, qui non credentes veritati susceperunt mendacium; de quo tempore & Saluator in Euangelio loquitur; Nisi abbreuiati essent dies illi, nequaquam salua esset omnis caro.* Non conuenire hæc tempora *Antiocho* in extrema visione dicemus. *A tyme signifieth a yeare, tymes according to the propriety of the hebrew speach, which haue also the duall number, prefigure two yeares, and halfe a tyme, six monthes, in which the Saintes are to be permitted to Antichrists power; that the Iewes may be condemned, who not beleiuing the truth receaued a lye; of which tyme our Sauiour also in the Ghospell saith; Except those daies should be shortned all flesh should not be safe. That these tymes agree not to* Antiochus, *we will teach in the last vision.* Thus farre *S. Hierome.* Dan. 7. Downams petitio principij

Where we see that both these places are to be vnderstood of Antichrist, and neither of *Antiochus*; which appeareth also by that in this Chapter, aswell as in the 12. there is expresse mention made of the last iudgment, as *S. Hierome* noted in the place which I alleaged before. So that his computation of the times out of 1. *Machab.* are not to the purpose: and besides as *S. Hierome* also noteth, that time is only three yeares: for so it is rather to be accompted frõ the 25. day of the moneth *Casleu*, when 1. *Machab.* 1. it is expressed, that the Gentiles first sacrificed *super aram, quæ erat contra altare: vpon the Are which was against the Altar*; and so the Scripture it selfe accompteth in the place alleadged by *M. Downam* 1. *Machab.* 4. secundum The interruptiõ of the Iewes Sacrifice was only three yeares.

dum tempus, & secundum diem, in qua contaminauerunt illud gentes; *according to the tyme, and according to the day, in which the Gentills defiled it*; and by this reckoning *M. Downam* hath lost his ten dayes, which he made so great accompt of, that hee was not afraid to corrupt the wordes of Scripture, by changing halfe a tyme into a parcell of a tyme, as though because halfe is not the whole, but a parcell; therefore euery parcell had bene halfe. But now by the Scripture and *S. Hieromes* accompt, he hath neither halfe nor parcell aboue three yeares, and yet they must haue an entyre halfe of *M. Downam*, or els he is like to smart for it one day.

Downam corrupteth the Scripture.

And is not this a strange conferring of Scripture thinke you, to alleadge a place of Scripture against himselfe, and then to change it, because otherwise it will not serue his turne? wheras indeed, if it had bene, as he would haue it, a parcell and not halfe, it had byn least of all to the purpose, except by that parcell we should haue vnderstood an halfe: for otherwise it had bene cleere, that these two places were spoken of diuers thinges. And this *M. Downam* did in some sort see: wherefore he telleth vs, *that vnto the victory obteyned by the* Machabees, *wherby the forces of* Antiochus *were expelled out of* Iury, *and wherby the restitution before begun, established, were* 3. *yeares and a halfe*, as Iosephus *testifieth*. But this maketh nothing to the purpose, as neither his other accomptes of 1260. *dayes to the striking of* Antiochus, *and* 1335. *vnto his death* (for which two later he neither citeth Scripture, or other Author) for heere is no conference of Scripture at all; and besides, if all this were so, which wee can hardly belieue, till it be better proued, it only sheweth a wonderfull correspondence betwixt *Antiochus* the figure, and *Antichrist* whom he figured, but no way proueth, that in the places of *Dan.* 7. and 12. there is any mention of *Antiochus*, which *S. Hierome* hath euidently disproued, and much lesse that they were only to be vnderstood of him; which is that, which it behoueth *M. Downam* to demonstrate: for otherwise *Bellarmines* argument hath his full force, and much more now, that there is no mention of *Antiochus*.

Downās conferring of Scripture.

See the next Chapter.

Antiochus not spoken of at all *Dan.* 7. & 12.

This then being so, I doubt not any discreet and indifferent Reader will graunt; that not only the Iewes, but

also

alſo the Chriſtians were to haue a continuall ſacrifice, and worſhip of God, which was not wholie to be interrupted vntill Antichriſts tyme: and againſt all *M. Downams* rayling, I need to oppoſe no other argument, but only this place, which is ſufficient to conuince any but obſtinate heretikes. And he bringeth not any one argument, but only affirmeth many blaſphemies without all proofe; and therefore at this tyme, the diſcreet Reader muſt expect no more but a bare denyall to a bare affirmation, for otherwiſe wee ſhould neuer make an end of iangling, if whenſoeuer he will blaſpheme, I ſhould leaue the principall queſtion, and refute other particulers altogeather from the preſent purpoſe, which ſeemeth to be that, which this Myniſter deſireth now, and the whole crew of them are wont to practiſe in all diſputations. Wherfore I will end this Chapter, requeſting my reader to conſider attentiuely if it be not euident out of this laſt proofe, *that Antichriſt is not yet come, that the Pope is moſt contrary to him, and that Proteſtants are his forerunners*, as *Bellarmine* inferred.

Downam & his fellow Miniſters their manner of diſputing.

THE EIGHT CHAPTER.

Conteyning the fifth Demonſtration.

I. « THE fifth Demonſtratiõ (ſaith *Bellarmine*) « is taken from the continuance of Anti- « chriſt. Antichriſt ſhall not reigne paſt « three yeares & a halfe. But the Pope hath « already reigned ſpiritually in the Church « aboue 1500. yeares; and there cannot be a- « ny aſſigned, who hath byn accompted « Antichriſt, who hath raigned preciſely three yeares and a « halfe. Wherfore the Pope is not Antichriſt, nor Antichriſt is « yet come.

II. « Now, that Antichriſts raigne ſhalbe three yeares and a « halfe, it is gathered out of *Dan. cap. 7. & 12.* and *Apoc. 12.* « where we read, that Antichriſts raigne ſhall indure *for a* « *tyme, and tymes, and halfe a tyme*: for by *a tyme* is vnderſtood one « yeare, by *tymes* two yeares, and by *halfe a tyme* halfe a yeare. « For ſo *S. Iohn* explicateth, who *Apoc. 11. and 13.* ſaith, that An- « tichriſt ſhall raigne 42. *Monthes*, which rightly make 3. yeares « & a halfe: & *cap. 11.* he ſaith, that *Henoch* and *Helias ſhall preach* « 1260. *dayes*. which make the ſame tyme, for the *Hebrews* did « vſe the yeares, and monthes of the Moone, though they did « reduce them to thoſe of the Sunne by adding euery ſixt yeare « one *Lunation*. And three yeares and a halfe of the Moone « make iuſt 42. moneths, or 1260. dayes. For a full & perfect « yeare of the Moone cõſiſteth of 12. monthes, euery one of « which

which hath 30. daies, as *S. Auguſt.* teacheth *l.* 15. *de ciu. Dei. c.* 14.

Neither is it againſt this, that *Dan.* 12. Antichriſt is ſaid to raigne 1290. daies, that *is* 30. daies more, then *S. Iohn* ſaid: for *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of *Henoch* and *Elias* which ſhalbe ſlain by Antichriſt one moneth before he periſh. III.

To this the Aduerſaries ānſwere in three ſorts: firſt *Chytræus* in *cap.* 11. & 13. *Apoc.*, ſaith, that theſe tymes cannot be taken for three yeares and a halfe, becauſe it is againſt experience, & *S. Paul* 2. *Theſſ.* 2. ſaith, that Antichriſt ſhal indure vntill Chriſts comming. IV.

Secondly he ſaith, that a certaine tyme is put for an vncertaine, and therfore for 42. monthes, or 1260. daies there are to be vnderſtood more then a 1000. years. The ſame ſaith *Bullenger ſerm.* 46. *in Apoc.* whoſe reaſon ſeemeth to be that, which *Luther* inſinuateth *in ſupput. temporum*, becauſe it is manifeſt *Apoc.* 20. that the Diuell is to be looſed in the thouſand yeare: wherfore the comming of Antichriſt with the temporall ſword was the thouſand yeare after Chriſt; therfore now he hath raigned more then fiue hundreth yeares: wherfore we muſt take thoſe 42. monthes for an vncertaine tyme. V.

Thirdly the *Magdeburgenſes* anſwere *cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. *col.* 438. that *Daniel* & *Iohn* take a day for a yeare, and therfore by a 1260. daies, wee muſt vnderſtand 1260. yeares: the reaſon may be, becauſe alſo *Dan.* 9. the 70. weekes are vnderſtood of all, to be weekes of yeares, and not of daies: & *Ezech.* 4. it is ſaid, *I haue giuen thee a day for a yeare:* & *Luc.* 13. *I muſt walk to day, & to morrow, & the next day*, that is, liue three yeares; which reaſon *Chytræus* giueth *in cap.* 11. *Apoc.* where he ſaith, that *theſe manner of yeares and monthes are called Angelicall, and not Humane.* VI.

But againſt this, is the common opinion of the Anci-ents, who affirme by reaſō of the places cited, that Antichriſt ſhall raigne only three yeares and a halfe. *S. Hippolytus Martyr in orat. de conſūmatione mundi Antichriſt ſhall raigne vpon the earth three yeares and a halfe, afterward his kingdome and glory ſhall be taken away.* S. Iren. lib. 5. in fine. *He ſhall raigne three yeares and ſix moneths, and then our Lord ſhall come from Heauen.* And S. Hierome in cap. 7. Dan. *A tyme ſignifieth a yeare, tymes according to the propriety of the Hebrew ſpeach, who haue alſo the duall number, preſigure two yeares, and halfe a tyme, ſix moneths, in which the Saintes are* VII.

« *to be permitted to the power of Antichrist*. S. Cyril catechesi 25. « *Antichrist shall raigne only three yeares and a halfe, which wee speake not* « *out of Apocriphall bookes, but out of the Prophet Dan.* And S. Aug. « lib. 20. de Ciuitate Dei, cap. 23. *That Antichrists kingdome* « *against the Church shalbe most cruell; though to be sustayned for a small* « *space of tyme, be that readeth these thinges euen halfe a sleepe is not suffered* « *to doubt; for that a tyme, & tymes, and a halfe tyme, are one yeare &* « *two, and one half, and consequentlie three yeares and a halfe, it is plaine* « *by the number of daies, which is put afterward, and sometyme it is de-* « *clared also in the Scripture by the number of moneths.* The like hath « *Theodoretus in cap. 7. Dan. Primasius, Beda, S. Anselme, Arethas,* « *Richardus, Rupertus.*

VIII. « Secondly it is proued, for that the Scriptures say, that « the tyme of the Diuel being loosed, and of Antichrist, shalbe « very short, *Apoc. 12. Woe be to the earth, and the sea, because the Di-* « *uill goeth downe to you, hauing great anger, knowing that he hath a small* « *tyme.* And *Apoc. 20. hee bound him for a thousand yeares, and after this* « *he must be loosed a small tyme.* How I pray you, shall this be true « if Antichrist shall raygne 1260. yeares? For so he shall be « longer loosed, then bound.

IX. « Thirdly, because, as *S. Aug.* argueth *lib. 20. de ciuitate* « *Dei cap. 8.* and *S. Gregory lib. 33. moral. cap. 12. vnlesse that* « *cruell persecution were most short, many would perish, which shall* « *not perish.* Wherefore our Lord saith *Matth. 24. vnlesse those dayes* « *had bene abreuiated, all flesh should not be safe.* But how shall it be « most short, which shall indure aboue a thousand yeares?

X. « Fourthly, Christ preached only three yeares and a « halfe, therfore it is also decent, that Antichrist be not per- « mitted to preach longer.

XI. « Fifthly, because the summe of 1260. yeares which the « Aduersaries appoynt, cannot any way be accommodated to « those wordes of *Dan.* & *S. Iohn, a tyme, and tymes, and halfe a* « *tyme*; for by a time without doubt must be vnderstood some « one nũber, as one day, one weeke, one moneth, one yeare, one « Lustre, one Iubily, one age, one Millenarie or thousand; & « if wee take this last, then Antichrist shall raigne 1500. yeares « which the aduersaries admit not: if wee take one age, An- « tichrists tyme shalbe 350. yeares, which likewise they ad- « mit not: and the same is manifest of a Iubily &c.

Sixtely

Sixtely, becauſe when *Dan.*4. wee often read, that 7. » *tymes ſhall paſſe* in which *Nabuchodonoſor* ſhalbe out of his king- » XII.
dome, by thoſe tymes all vnderſtand .7 .yeares, for if wee »
would vnderſtand yeares of yeares, as the aduerſaries vnder- »
ſtand, when Antichriſt is ſpoken of, wee ſhould ſaie, that »
Nabuchodonoſor lyued out of his Kingdome 2555. yeares. »

Neither is it hard to ſolue their ſlender reaſons; for » XIII.
when *Chytræus* ſaith, that the three yeares and an halfe, of »
which *Daniel* and *S. Iohn* ſpeake, cannot be taken properly »
for our vſuall yeares, becauſe experience witneſſeth that »
Antichriſt hath tyranized much longer already; he mani- »
feſtlie repeateth or beggeth the principle, or beginning, as »
the *Logitians* ſpeake, for hee taketh or aſſumeth that which »
is in controuerſie: for that the queſtion is, whether Anti- »
chriſt be come or noe. And when he addeth that Antichriſt »
by *S. Paules* opinion ſhall raigne till the ſecond comming of »
Chriſt, and thereupon concludeth, that hee muſt raigne »
longer then three yeares and a halfe, hee ſeeth not that hee »
either repeateth the principle againe or ſaith nothing; for »
that illation prooueth nothing, vnles it be aſſumed, that »
Antichriſt is already come, which notwithſtanding is in »
controuerſy. »

And to that, which both hee and *Henry Bullenger* ſay, » XIV.
that *a certaine number is taken for an vncertaine* in this place: I an- »
ſwere, that then only a certaine number is put for an vncer- »
taine, when ſome full and perfect number is put, as 10. 100. »
1000. and not when there are diuers numbers aſſigned, »
where there are great and little mingled. Wherefore then »
is a certaine number to be taken for an vncertaine, when »
the Scripture ſaith *Apoc.* 12. that the Diuell was bound for a »
1000. yeares, as *S. Auguſtine* expoundeth it, *lib.* 20. *de Ciuitate* »
Dei cap. 8. and *S. Gregory* 33. *moral. cap.* 12. and not when he »
aſſigneth *a tyme, & tymes, and halfe a tyme, or* 1260. *dayes, or* 42. »
monethes: for to what end is that diuerſity of nũbers, if an »
vncertaine tyme be deſigned? »

To the argument of *Illyricus*, I ſay, that in the Scripture » XV.
there are indeed found, and rightely called *weekes of yeares*, »
but not dayes for yeares, or moneths of yeares: for *weekes* »
of yeares wee read *Leuit.* 25. *Thou ſhalt number to thy ſelfe ſeauen* »
weekes

weeke of yeares &c. and that rightly, it is manifest, because a
« weeke is denominated of the number of 7. in greeke, in la-
« tin, & in hebrew; for the hebrewes call a weeke *Seabuagh*,
« of *Scheuagh*, which is seauen, as also in Greke it is called
« ἑβδομὰς, and in Latin *septimana*, of the number of 7. Wher-
« fore as 7. daies are called a weeke of daies; so, seauen yeares
« a weeke of yeares but we no where read a moneth of yeares
« or a day for a yeare: neither were it rightly spoken. For a
« month is not denominated of any number, but of the course
« of the Moone, which is finished in 30. daies, for which cause
« the hebrewes call a moneth *Jareach*, that is a Moone, or
« *chiresch*, that is a renewing, to wit of the Moone, and
« in greeke a moneth is called μήν, because the Moone is
« called μήνη.

« Likewise *a Day*, doth not signify number: but the
XVI. « tyme of light, *Gen.* 1. God called the light Daie, and dark-
« nesse Night. Neither is that of *Ezech.* 4. against this, *I haue*
« *giuen thee a day for a yeare*: for the meaning is not, that by daies
« litterally are signifyed yeares, otherwise *Ezechiel* should haue
« slept vpon his left side 390. yeares, which is vnpossible.
« For God commaunded him to sleep vpon his left side 390.
« daies, and added, *I haue giuen thee a day for a yeare*. If ther-
« fore those daies be taken for yeares, *Ezechiel* should haue
« slept vpon his left side 390. yeares: but he liued not so long;
« wherfore daies are taken there truly for dayes, but are said
« to be giuen for yeares: because those 390. dayes in which *E-*
« *zechiel* slept, were a signe of the sleeping of God, by which
« he tolerated the sins of the Israelites 390. yeares.

« To that which *Chytreus* obiecteth out of *Luc.* 13. *I must*
XVII. « *walke to day, and to morrow, and the daie following*: I answere that
« it is not signified in those wordes (as the erring Aduersaries
« say) that Christ was to preach three yeares after; for our
« Lord spake those wordes the last yeare of his life. For as *S.*
« *Hierom* writeth *lib. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, in Ioanne*, and the
« thing it selfe sheweth, *S. Matth. S. Marke*, and *S. Luke* wrote
« not the deedes and wordes of Christ of the former two
« yeares, but only those of the third. Wherfore our Lord by
« those three daies either vnderstood the three daies, which he
« was

was to ſpend in the iourney to *Hieruſalem*, as *Albert* and *Caietan* expound it; or els by that manner of ſpeach would ſignify that he ſhould liue and preach a little tyme after, as *Ianſenius* rightly teacheth. Therefore let *Illyricus* and *Chytræus* bethinke themſelues, where they found Angelicall daies and *moneths*, for they are not to be found in Scripture.

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

1. BEFORE *M. Downam* beginneth to anſwere any thing to this demonſtration, he childiſhly beareth his Reader in hand, that *Bellarmine* teacheth vs *not to looke for Antichriſt, vntill he be gone, nor to expect his comming till the world haue an end:* becauſe in this, & the next demonſtratiõ he proueth, that Antichriſt is not yet come (as the Heretikes affirme) becauſe if they ſayd truth, he ſhould likewiſe haue bene gone, and the world alſo haue bene ended long ere this, ſince he was not to raigne, but three yeares and a halfe, and the world was not to endure long after. And the heretikes, euen *M. Downam* himſelf affirme, that Antichriſt came a thouſand yeares ſince. Wherfore this ſilly ſhift will not ſerue his turne; but except he can diſproue *Bellarmines* aſſertion of the ſhort tyme of Antichriſts raigne, and of the ſpeedy end of the world afterward, it will be manifeſt to any indifferent Reader, that he and his fellowes haue moſt ſhamefully abuſed the world, in affirming that Antichriſt came ſo many yeares agone. Wherfore let vs ſee, what he can anſwere to *Bellarmines* proofes.

Downãs childiſh cauill.

2. But firſt you muſt giue him leaue once more to bewray his ſhameles folly, for he will needes reſolue *Bellarmines* argument, and ſo make him bring the mayne queſtion for an argument. But theſe are his idle conceiptes, for the matter is plaine inough, ſince *Bellarmine* argueth thus: Whoſoeuer ſhalbe Antichriſt, ſhall raigne only three yeares and a halfe, but none hitherto hath done ſo: *Ergo*, none hitherto hath bene Antichriſt. Wherfore except *M. Downam* anſwereth to this argument in forme, he *may well daunce in a round*, but will ſay nothing to the purpoſe; which he himſelf ſeeth

Downam changeth Bellarmines argumẽt.

meth to acknowledge, saying immediately after: *But to come to the purpose, viz.* from which he had spoken all this while.

2. And now we shall find him farre more coole: for first he graunteth the assumption or *minor*, so farre as is necessary, to wit, that the *Pope hath reigned more then three yeares, & a halfe: viz.* a thousand yeares, which is sufficient for our purposes, and therefore I will not striue with him about the other 500. yeares, because I would not be like him in speaking from the purpose. Wherefore let vs see what he can say to the proposition, *concerning which*, he affirmeth, *the whole controuersie to be*. And so hee flatly denieth it, affirming that the places of *Daniel*, are to be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, and not of Antichrist, and repeateth his Chymericall distinctions inuented by himselfe of the 4. degrees, in the deliuerance of the Iewes from the Tyranny of *Antiochus*, for which hee hath neither Scripture nor other author, but only *Iosephus* corrupted by some fauourite of *Porphyrie*; & of his owne exposition of *Daniel*, for *S. Hierome* found no difference betwixt *Ioseph*, and the *Machabees*, but both affirmed, that the desolation of the Temple lasted only three yeares, and by their authoritie he manifestlie conuinceth, that *Daniel* cannot be vnderstood of the tyme of *Antiochus*, but of Antichrist, because he putteth halfe a yeare more then the sacrifice ceased among the Iewes in the tyme of *Antiochus*. Wherefore it is manifest, that *S. Hierome* found but 3. yeares in *Ioseph*, and that the 6. monethes were added since: and if *Ioseph* had written otherwise, he were to be euidently conuinced of falshood out of the *Machabees*, which *M. Downam* would gladlie conceale, and therefore he maketh *Ioseph* to speake of another degree, and putteth his words only in Greeke: but all these deuises will not serue his turne, since he expresly affirmed, that the dailie sacrifice ceased 3. yeares and six monethes. *Ipse* (Antiochus) *& Templum spoliauit, & quotidiana religionis assidua ritè per annos tres sexq; menses inhibuit*: which is flatlie against the *Machabees*, and *M. Downam* himself also, who will haue it to haue byn only 3. yeares and ten daies, & so maketh *Daniel* to agree with him, by changing halfe a yeare into a parcell; and would no doubt willingly haue done

Antichrist shall raigne three yeares & a halfe. *Dan. 7. & 12.*

Iosephus corrupted.

See the precedent Chapter.

done as much for *Ioseph*, but that hee could not conuey it cleanly, becauſe he expreſly reckoneth 6. monethes, as now wee haue him, but indeed only accompted three yeares, as *S. Hierome* citeth him, and ſo he agreeth paſſing well with the *Machabees*; and it is euident, that *Daniel* ſpake not of *Antiochus*, but Antichriſts tyme, as hath bene ſufficiently proued, aſwell by this number of three yeares, and a halfe, as by other circumſtances, which agree not to *Antiochus*, in the former Chapter. And this is all he hath to ſay about the places of *Daniel*, only he repeateth an obiection, which *Bellarmine* made to himſelfe, that *Daniel reckoneth* 1290. *daies*, *and S. Iohn but* 1260. 30. *leſſe*. To which he anſwered, that *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of the preaching of *Henoch* and *Helias*, and *Daniel* of the death of Antichriſt, which ſhalbe 30. daies after, in which he ſhall not raigne ſo abſolutly as before, and therfore this laſt moneth is not commonly accompted in his raigne, as neither the yeares before, in which hee obteyned to the height of his greatnes. For after the death, reſurrection, and aſſumption of *Enoch* and *Helias*, the *third part of the City ſhall fall, and* 7000. *ſhalbe ſlaine with an earthquake, and the reſt ſhalbe terrified, and giue glory to the God of Heauen*, as *S. Iohn* writeth *Apoc.* 11. by which Antichriſts kingdome ſhalbe much diminiſhed, though hee ſhall liue one moneth longer, and perſecute ſo much as he may, as the Angel tould *Daniel*, being deſirous to know what was to follow after the 3. yeares and a halfe.

Hierom. in cap. 12. Dan.

III.

Anticriſts laſt moneth is not accõpted in his raigne.

Dan. cap. 12.

II.

3. The places of the *Apoc.* trouble *M. Downam* ſhrewdly, and therfore he giueth ſix ſolutions (ſuch as they are) poore ones, God wot. Firſt then he denieth that the tymes mentioned in the 11. 12. and 13. chapters are the ſame, and putteth *Bellarmine* to proue it, becauſe he himſelf hath neither reaſon nor authority to impugne it withal, both which *Bellarmine* hath alleadged for his expoſition, in which there is no difficultie, *where wee are to begin the accompt.* Neither will *M. Downams* bare word be taken, affirming, that *all theſe tymes are not to be taken litterally*, and that *none of them* defineth *Antichriſts raigne*. For *Bellarmine* expreſly proueth the contrary. But, ſaith *M. Downam*, *the* 42. *moneths in the* 11. *and* 13. *Chapters ſignifie the tyme of the perſecution vnder the Roman Emperours*

Apoc. 11. 12. 13.

perours, either only or specially. For cap. 11. v. 2. it is said, that the Gentills shall tread vpon the holy City 42. moneths. But Antichrist as the Papists hold, shalbe the Prince of the Iewes, and counterfaite Christians: and of all the wicked in generall also, as M. Downam cannot choose but know, if he would deale sincerely, and not seeke for shiftes, and starting-holes. For in the last Chapter that was plainly, not only affirmed, but also proued, as afterward it shall againe: as likewise in due place, that the great Citty, where the two witnesses shalbe slaine, is Hierusalem & not Rome; though if it were Rome, it were no proofe, but that they might be slain by Antichrist there, in whose tyme they shall preach, as hath bene largly conuinced. By which it is likewise manifest that these places are to be vnderstood of Antichrist. But nothing conuinceth this more euidently then the foolish dreame of the foole Fox, whome the diuell which seemeth to haue perswaded him, rightly so called, because he was so blockish, as to beleiue so absurd a deuise, which notwithstanding M. Downam is content to make his cheifest ground, because he hath no better, to wit, that by 42. moneths should be vnderstood so many sabbaths, or weekes of yeares. Was there euer a more absurd or ridiculous deuise inuented, or maintayned? Is this the sincere exposition of Scripture, which they so greatly brag and boast of? what connexion hath 30. dayes with 7. yeares? Surely a moneth contayneth 4. weekes. VVherfore if they will haue these 42. monthes to be vnderstood of yeares, they must not tell vs of 42. weekes of yeares, but of so many monthes, which they cannot do; and besides Bellarmine well proueth, that there are not moneths of yeares, as there are weekes, and much lesse that moneths are taken for weekes, which is a meere madnesse to imagine, and altogeather as absurd as to thinke that Foxes head was of glasse, as he is reported to haue most fōdly imagined. And yet is M. Downā cōtēt thus to shift of the difficulty of all these places, thinking it sufficient to haue found this goodly Glosse for the 42. months, and that the number of daies, or yeares need no further explication, but is to be reduced to these 42. weekes of yeares though neither himself, nor any man els, can possibly inuent how to make thē agree. For first cōcerning the daies, if we take

Antichrist shalbe the Prince of all the wicked in generall.

See cap. 13.

The foolish dreame of the foole Fox.

XV.

There are no moneths of yeares.

take a day for a yeare, and after this accompt, we can take it for no lesse, they make 4. tymes as many yeares as the 42. sabbothes come to at least, and then what shall we make of the three yeares and a halfe? Surely this is an endles labour and labyrinth; but to this passe must these good fellowes needes come, that will go about to frame Scripture to their owne brittle and beetle braines.

Downam & Fox their absurd exposition of Scripture.

But yet *M. Downam* will giue one attempt more about the three yeares and a halfe, which he thinketh may be vnderstod of the tyme, *wherin the Church of Christ, which was at Hierusalem, after it was admonished by a voice out of the Sanctuary to depart, and accordingly remoued to Pella, was sustayned there.* In which deuise; First he must graunt that the 1260. dayes; signify also 3. yeares and a halfe, for the same space in this Chapter is twice accompted, once by tymes, and againe by dayes: by which it wil seeme more the probable, that the moneths are to be vnderstood so also, and so the foole *Fox* hath lost his bable; and besides, many things in this 12. Chapter cannot be applied to those few Christians which were at *Hierusalem*, as the battaile betwixt *Michael* and the *Diuell*, the great persecution which was raised against the *woman &c.* But *M. Downam* obiecteth, that in this 12. Chapter, *there is no speach of Antichrist, but of the Diuel, who first seeketh to ouerthrow the Church of Christ among the Iewes, and afterward commeth to the Gentiles, and therfore it is said, that he standeth vpon the sea shore, from whence he rayseth the Beast with 7. heades &c.* where it is meruaile, that he did not marke, how the Serpent or Dragon had 7. heads and ten hornes, aswell as this beast, and consequently, that they are both to be at the same tyme; and to be the chiefe causers of this great persecution: yet with this difference, that the diuell is the cause of all other, aswell as this. Wherfore not vnfitly Antichrist is here called his taile, in which chiefly the venome of this serpent lyeth: so that whatsoeuer *Antichrist* shall do either by himselfe or his instruments, may be peculiarlie applied to the Diuell. For which cause the Diuell in Antichrists tyme cannot be more liuely set forth then by the same description, which representeth Antichrist himselfe, by which *M. Downams* deuise is quite ouerthrowne and become ridiculous, as also his profe, for that *the Diuell is*

Apoc. 12.

The diuel and Antichrist described after the same maner.

said to stand vpon the sea shore, from whence hee raiseth the beast with 7. heads &c. for this proueth nothing but that Antichrist, is a beast of the Diuells raising, and hath his power from him, which no man denieth: though I meruaile how *M. Downam* forgot his Greeke in this place, in which wee read ἐστάθη (*steti:*) as also *Andreas Arethas, Erasmus, Rupertus*, and *Codex Complutensis* haue it; and consequently it were to be referred to *S. Iohn* himselfe, who signifieth whither he was carried in spirit to see the beast (which followeth) arise; for which cause diuers ancient writers begin the next chapter at those words.

4. In the second place *M. Downam* addeth, that by *Bellarmines* interpretation of those tymes, it would follow, *that after Antichrist is once reuealed, all men that be acquainted with the Scriptures, may precisely define before hand the very day of Christs comming vnto iudgment, which the Lord notwithstanding will not haue knowne* Mar. 13. 32. *as Bellarmine himselfe must needes graunt, seeing he vseth this, as the chiefe argumēt against those who by 1260. daies vnderstand so many yeares.* To which I answere that no such thing can be gathered out of *Bellarmine*, who lately also *Apolog. cap.* 10. hath plainly declared, that in his opinion, there can no more be gathered out of the Prophet *Daniel*, then that the world shall endure at least 45. dayes after Antichrists death, but whether longer or no, that the Scripture declareth not: but indeed *S. Hierome* wryteth plainly, that 45. dayes after Antichrists death, Christ shall come to Iudgment. Out of which wee willingly graunt, that those which liue at the tyme of Antichrists death may easilie gather out of Scripture, how far the day of iudgment is off. Neyther is this against *Mar.* 13. 32. where our Sauiour only saith, that at that tyme it was only knowne to God, which hindereth not, but that hereafter it may be gathered by *Daniels* prophesie, when it is within so few dayes.

Whether those that liue at Antichrists death, may gather how long they haue to the end of the world or no?

But *M. Downam* addeth further in his 6. Chapter, that our *Sauiour Matth.* 24. 39. *and Luc.* 17. 26. *hath foretould, that the end of the world shalbe suddaine, and vnlooked for euen as it was in the daies of Noah and Lot.* This is the obiection which I referred to this place, as belonging to it, and *Daniel* answereth it with a distinction, that at the death of Antichrist

there

there shalbe both good and wicked men, as there were in the time of *Noah* and *Lot*, and euer since. Now saith *Daniel*, the wicked shall doe wickedly, and none of them shall vnderstand (these mysteries, though they be so plainely foretould) and of these speaketh our Sauiour when he saith, that the day of iudgemẽt shall come vnlooked for. But *Daniel* addeth further, *porrò docti intelligent*; the learned shall vnderstand them, and may make a certaine collection of the tyme of the daie of Iudgement, when they once see Antichrist dead, that is, such pious interpreters as *S. Hierome* was. And this difference wee see in the tyme of *Noah* and *Lot*, and now also: for though the Scripture speaketh plainly of Antichrist and his persecution, and how long it is to continue: yet wicked *Porphyrie*, *M. Downam*, and the rest of that crew vnderstand it not: but *S. Hierome* and other holy Saintes and Catholikes instructed by them vnderstand it plainely. So true is, and euer was, and shalbe that saying of the Wiseman, *In malevolam animam non introibit sapientia*. Wisdome will not enter into a wicked and malicious soule; such as all heretikes haue, and alway had, though they brag neuer so much of Scripture, and their priuate spirit, which is one of the chiefest branches of their impiety. Neither doth this any whit infring *Bellarmines* argument against those which expound the 1260. daies to be so manie yeares: for they cannot haue any ground at all, to affirme that those yeares are to begin more at one tyme, then at another, and yet euery one by assigning what tyme it pleaseth him, must needs graunt, that from that tyme vntill Christs comming there are iust so many yeares, which is, to take vpon them to know that, which Christ said was so hydden, that without an euident reuelation, as that of *Daniel* is, after Antichrists death, no man, nor Angell can know it. So that *Bellarmine* vseth that argument, only to disproue the tyme, which *Illyricus* and others appoint of Antichrists comming, and not absolutly to reproue that interpretation; as *M. Downam* would haue his reader think. Wherefore in all this Chapter, in which he so largelie refuteth that interpretation, he neuer vrgeth that illation. But this is no iugling at all in *M. Downãs* conceipt.

Only the iust & learned shall make this collectiõ.

Sap. 1.

Downãs iugling.

ceipt.

Thirdly, saith M. Downā, *It is incredible, if not impossible, that so many and so great thinges, as they assigne to Antichrist should be effected, and brought to passe in so short a tyme, as* Hentenius *a learned Papist doth confesse, and as hath bene shewed heretofore. If* M. Downā had set downe these many and great thinges wee might perhaps haue shewed him how many of them were not to be done in these 3. yeares and a halfe, in which notwithstanding Antichrist may doe very many by himselfe, and his Ministers, hauing all the world at command; and thus is *Hentenius* to be expounded, who only thinketh it impossible for Antichrist to obtaine so many Kingdomes and Prouinces in so short a space: which maketh nothing at all against vs, who rather think, that this short tyme is to begin after those victoryes be ended. *M. Downās* other proofes are to be examined in their due places.

In præfat. translat. Areth.

Fourthlie (saith M. Downā) *VVhen wee proued that Antichrist is not any one man alone, but a whole State and succession of men, we proued this by consequence, that his raigne was not to continue only three yeares and a halfe.* He saith well: for when he can proue the one, he may proue the other; but he will neuer be able to proue either, as the Reader will easily see, by conferring his proofes, and my answeres togeather: which now it is no tyme nor place to do.

See chap. 2.

Fiftly (saith M. *Downam*) *Antichrist according to the conceipt of the Papists is to raigne before the preaching of the two witnesses, and as Bell. saith, is to cōtinue one moneth after their death. Seeing thē the two witnesses preach 1260. dayes, which as Bellarmine also saith make three yeares & a halfe precisely; how can the terme of Antichrists raigne, be three yeares & a halfe precisely?* First M. Downā might haue done well to haue named those Papists who cōceipt Antichrists raigne before the preaching of the two witnesses, for we would haue byn so bould, as to haue tould them, that they were in a wrong conceipt, vnles they meāt that he should be of great power before; but yet not of so great, as he shalbe for the space of three yeares and a halfe, in which these two glorious witnesses shall preach, as neither in his last moneth after their death, by which he shall receaue such a blow, that his kingdome shalbe so much diminished, that the last moneth

Enoch & Elias shall begin to preach in the beginning of Antichrists Raigne.

is

is not accompted to belong to the height of his raigne, as before we alſo explicated out of *Apoc.* 11. and ſo there remayneth iuſt three yeares and a halfe for Antichriſts reigne, and theſe two holy witneſſes preaching. Laſtly he remitteth himſelfe to his proofes, that Antichriſt *was come in the Apoſtles tyme, and reuealed in the yeare* 670. for anſwere of which bare aſſertion (for heere he goeth not about to proue any thing) I muſt likewiſe remit my Reader to the anſwers which I gaue to thoſe his proofes in their due places, and ſo leaue him to iudge how well *M. Downam* hath anſwered *Bellarmines* allegations, and confuted his aſſertions.

Supra nu. 2.

See Chap. 3.

5. After *Bellarmine* had propoſed his owne argument out of Scriptures, he ſetteth downe three diſtinct anſweres of the Proteſtants to thoſe places, which he refuteth: firſt by the authority of the Fathers, who with one accord expound thoſe places in that ſenſe: to which *M. Downam* giueth no other anſwere, but that *they could not vnderſtand* thoſe propheſies; which is plaine dealing indeed, and ſufficiently manifeſteth *Downãs* proud priuate ſpirit, which dareth tell ſo many holy Fathers, and pillars of Gods Church, that he knoweth more, then they all, and that they ſayd they knew not what, when they interpreted thoſe propheſies in that ſort: which I would thinke ſhould be ſufficiẽt for all ſoules, to fly from ſuch proud *Luciferian* ſpirites, as this fellow, and his Companions haue.

IV. V. VI. VII. Downam inſolently reiecteth the Fathers.

To *Bellarmines* ſecõd proofe *M. Downam* hath more to ſay: for firſt he reprehendeth *Bellarmine*, for ſaying, that the *Scriptures affirme, the tyme of the diuels looſing & Antichriſts raigne, to be* breuiſſimum, *very ſhort, or moſt ſhort*, they only ſaying, *that it is ſhort, or ſmal.* But his VViſdome ſhould haue conſidered, that *Bellarmine* putteth that *breuiſſimum* for the ſenſe, and not for the wordes of the Scripture; which afterward he alleadgeth as they ly; ſo that if they import a very ſhort, or moſt ſhort tyme, *Bellarm.* is not to blame. But *M. Downã* denieth this alſo, ſhewing at large, that many tymes a thouſãd yeares or more in Scripture are accoumpted but as a day, or a very ſhort tyme, *in reſpect of the Lord, who ſpeaketh in the Scripture:* which we willingly graunt: but he ſhould haue ſhewed vs, that theſe places now in queſtion are to be vnderſtood in reſpect

VIII. Bellarmin vniuſtly charged.

Apoc. 12.

of the Lord, and not rather in respect of the thousand yeares, in which the Diuell was bound. And *cap.* 17. it is yet more plaine, that Antichrist shall raigne a small tyme in respect of the 6. Kinges, which went before him, which howsoeuer *M. Downam* vnderstandeth them, cannot be said to haue raigned much more then a thousand yeares a peece. Neither is it true, that *Antichrist not only was, but also persecuted those, that refused his marke, within the thousand yeares of Sathans imprisonment:* though *S. Iohn. Apoc.* 20. saw the Martyrs in the tyme of Antichrist, togeather with those which were before; of which only he speaketh, when he saith that they liued and raigned with Christ in the thousand yeares: except some will say with *S. Ambrose*, that the Martyrs in the tyme of Antichrist are said to raigne (before they were) in the former Martyrs, because they were members of the same body: or that the thousand yeares are diuersly taken. And thus wee see plainly, that the tyme of Antichristes raigne, and the Diuells being loose, is said to be a very short tyme.

The tyme of Antichrists raigne verie short.

Apoc. 17.

Apoc. 20.

IX. 6. To the third argument he answereth briefely, that *S. Augustine* &c. did mistake the place *Matth.* 24. 21. and that it is *to be vnderstood of the calamitie of the Iewes*, as he hath manifestly prooued (if you will beleiue him:) but if you will take a view of my answere to his proofes, perhaps you will thinke them manifestly fond and foolish. Secondly he saith, that *wee are to distinguish betwixt the tyme of Antichrists continuance, & the tyme of his hoatest persecution*; which we willingly admit, though so, that we alway thinke, that his whole persecution shalbe most hoat: for we find no cold persecution of his at all. Wherefore if he will graunt vs, that the great and hoat persecution of Antichrist, which is spoken of in the Scripture shalbe very short, least in a manner all perish, we desire no more; and thus much we must haue whether he will or no, since the Scripture truly interpreted by the holy Fathers expresly affirmeth it.

Matth. 24. Downam reiecteth S. Augustine & S. Gregory.

See chap. 4.

In answering the fourth congruence, he is somewhat large. First he saith, that *Bellarmine presupposeth that Antichrist is but one man*, which is true in some sort, because he had prooued it before, and yet proueth it now againe thus farre, that it is very improbable, that more then one should be neces-

sarie

farie for the ſpace of 3. yeares and a halfe, longer then which Chriſt preached not; and therefore in likelihood Antichriſt ſhall preach no longer neither.

Secondly he taketh vp *Bellarmine* very ſhort, *for making himſelf Gods Commſaylour*: which yet is farre otherwiſe, for he only ſeeketh reaſons of that, which is already knowne that God hath done. For I would haue *M. Downam* know, that *Bellarmine* is too wiſe to haue deliuered any certainty only vpon this congruence, and therefore would by no meanes make that inference, which he would haue him, that Antichriſt ſhall peruert no more then Chriſt conuerted, becauſe it is farre more eaſie to peruert, then to conuert, and ſo the conuerting of thoſe few, or any one of them which Chriſt conuerted, ſheweth farre more power, then all that peruerting doth in Antichriſt, which bewrayeth no power at all, but malice and hatred: and yet would not *Bellarmine* ſay neither, that Chriſt as man could conuert no more, thē he did, but that he vſed ſufficient meanes to conuert farre more, and could haue vſed more; but he is wont to proceed ſweetly, though effectually with his elect, whereas Antichriſt vſeth all cruelty and extremitie, and findeth men more diſpoſed to follow him, then Chriſt did, and therfore there is no compariſon betwixt them two in this, but only it ſeemeth vnfitting for vs to thinke, that Gods goodnes will giue Antichriſt a longer tyme to vſe all thoſe barbarous and tyrānycall meanes, then was allotted to Chriſt, only to allure men by his diuine perſwaſions, and admirable workes.

The conuerting of one, argueth more power thē the peruerting of many.

Thirdly he would make a difference betwixt Chriſt and Antichriſt, in that Chriſt hath ſpoken *by the mouth of his Prophets and Miniſters*. As though Antichriſt hath not alway had his Miniſters alſo, all heretikes; and now *M. Downam*, and his rable muſt be content to let all the world but themſelues thinke, that they are his Miniſters. Fourthly hee would begin to proue, that Antichriſt cannot doe all thoſe thinges which Catholikes attribute to him, in ſo ſhort a tyme. But this is another matter now, and he cannot deny but that Antichriſt may raiſe a generall perſecution in all his Kingdomes in one tyme, from which daie for-

Antichriſt may raiſe a vniuerſall perſecution, at one time,

ward, let *M. Downam* begin to reckon the three yeares & a halfe of his raigne, & if any thing cannot be well comprized within this ſpace, we will not ſtick to graunt, that it was to be done before, as the ſubduing of ſo many Kingdoms &c.

XI. To the 5. and 6. proofe he only ſaith, that *they are not worth the mentioning.* But it ſhould ſeeme he meant, they were too
XII. hoat to be touched without burning his fingers, and therfore he thought it beſt to haue only a ſnach & away, ſaying: *that the tyme, and tymes, and halfe a tyme, as hath byn shewed, belong not to antichriſts raigne,* and that *he taketh tymes for yeares.* How he hath ſhewed that this belongeth not to Antichriſts raigne, we haue already ſeene and refuted. But now *Bellarmine* vrgeth, how the 1260. daies being taken for yeares can agree with three yeares and a halfe: and here *M. Downam* was faine to ſkippe, for otherwiſe he could not haue eſcaped: and it is inough in this place that he graunteth vs, that a tyme, and tymes, and halfe a time ſignify three yeares and a halfe: for by this it is manifeſt, that both the 42. monthes, as alſo the 1260. dayes, ſignify the ſame, and conſequently that Antichriſt is to raigne no longer, ſince that it is euydent, that they are vnderſtood of his tyme, as hath ben plainly proued.

Downam omitteth what he cannot anſwere.

XIII. 7. In the laſt place *M. Downam* goeth about to reply to the anſwers which *Bellarmine* gaue to his fellowes reaſons; and firſt to keep *Chytraeus* out of the ditch, he lendeth him his authority, ſaying, that he ſaith it as well as *Chytraeus*, at which I imagine the Reader will laugh; and then becauſe he ſaw that the place of *S. Paul* proued nothing neither, vnleſſe it might be graunted, that Antichriſt was already come, he lendeth him another of *S. Iohn*, affirming *that the Antichriſt was come in his tyme*: at which I ſuppoſe *Chytraeus* would chafe: For now we ſhall haue Antichriſt to endure as long as Chriſt; & beſides *S. Iohn* affirmeth not, that the Antichriſt was come in his tyme, but that he had many members then, as hath byn ſufficiently proued in due place; ſo that *Chytraeus* remayneth in as ill caſe, as he was before *M. Downam* layd to his helping hand. But yet once againe he will try what he can do for him and *Henry Bullenger* together, which he performeth with a very ſubtill diſtinction, ſaying: that *they ſpeake*

Chap. 2. Downam cānot defend his fellowes.

XIV.

of

of the tyme, & Bellarm. of the nũber; so that there shalbe iust 42. & 1260. but no man can tell of what. And is not this a wise expositiõ think you? Will not *Chytraeus* & *Bullenger* be ashamed of such a Proctor, who make the say they know not what thekselues. But M. *Downã* will haue their credit if they will be ruled by him by bringing their vncertainties to some certainety, as to the 42. *sabbothes* of *Iohn Fox*, & the 1260. *yeares* of the *Magdeburgẽses*, the former of which I refuted before, and the latter is here exploded by *Bellarmine*: in defence of which *M. Downam* hath nothing to say, but to repeate their Argument out of *Ezechiel*, without seeming to vnderstand *Bellarmines* distinction, denying that daies are litterally taken there for yeares; which is necessary for their argument, though they may be a signe or figure of yeares, and consequently signify the mysticallie, as tho e 390. daies in which *Ezechiel* slept vpon his left side, were a figure and signe of so many yeares, euen as his sleeping was a sign of the toleration which God vsed towards the people of *Israel*: but yet none but a mad man will say, that *Ezechiels* sleeping is to be vnderstood litterally of Gods tolerating, so that when he was bidden to sleepe so many dayes, God was litterally commaunded to sleepe so many yeares. Neither is *M. Downams* addition out *of some of the learned*, namely *Iunius*, any thing to the purpose. For *Apoc.* 20. only the number of 10. is put indefinitely, as is vsually in Scripture, so that 10. daies is all one, as if he had said many dayes. And this is all, that *M. Downã* can say for his fellow Ministers. Now he will say some thing against them, telling them plainly that if they take daies for *yeares*, it will follow, that the speciall tyme of Christs comming may be foretould after the Reuelation of Antichrist, which he thinketh must in no wise be graunted: and we haue shewed how far the Catholikes may fortell it without danger of any inconuenience. Wherfore we may now conclude this Chapter, in which it sufficiently appeareth, that Antichrist is not come, as the heretikes affirme.

XV. XVI. XVII.

Ezech. 4.

Dayes are not taken for yeares

Apoc. 21

THE

THE NINTH CHAPTER.

Conteyning the sixt Demonstration.

I. THE sixt Demonstration (saith *Bellarmine*) is taken from the last signe, which shall follow after Antichrist, which shalbe the end of the world: for the comming of Antichrist shalbe a little before the end of the world. Wherefore if Antichrist had byn come long since, the world should haue byn ended long since also. The Prophet *Daniel cap. 7.* speaking twice of *Antichrist*, once telling his vision, and afterward expounding it, both times addeth, that after *Antichrist*, shall forthwith follow the iudgment. *I considered* (sayth he) *the hornes, and behould another little horne aroſe, and three of the firſt hornes were pulled of before his face. I beheld vntill the Thrones were placed, and the Ancient of daies ſate &c.* And after expounding the vision: *The fourth beaſt* (saith he) *shalbe the fourth Kingdome, and the 10. hornes shalbe 10. Kinges, and another shall ariſe after them, and he shalbe more potent then the former, and shall humble 3. Kinges &c. and they shalbe deliuered into his hand for a time, and tymes, and a halfe a tyme, and Iudgment shall ſit &c.*

II. The like Propheſie hath S. *Iohn Apoc. 20. After theſe things, he muſt be looſed a tittle tyme: and I ſaw ſeates, and they ſate vpon them, and iudgement was giuen vnto them &c.* And againe the Prophet *Dan.* after hee had said *cap. 12.* that Antichrists Kingdome

done ſhould endure 1290. daies, addeth: *Bleſſed is he which expecteth, and commeth to 1335. daies*, that is to 45. daies after Antichriſts death, for then will our Lord come to iudgement, and will reſtore the Crownes of Iuſtice to the conquerors; as *S. Hierome*, and *Theodoret* expound it in their Commentaries vpon this place.

Beſides, the ſame is gathered out of *Matth.* 24. *This Ghoſpell of the Kingdome ſhalbe preached in the whole world, for a teſtimony to all nations, and then ſhall the end be*: that is, a little after ſhall the end of the world be, and after forthwith. *After the tribulation of thoſe daies the ſun ſhalbe darkened, and the moone ſhall not giue her light, and then ſhall the ſigne of the Sonne of man appeare &c.* The ſame appeareth out of 2. *Theſſ.* 2. *Then ſhall that wicked one be reuealed, whom our Lord Ieſus ſhall kill with the ſpirit of his mouth, & ſhall deſtroy with the brightnes of his comming &c.* where the Apoſtle teacheth, that almoſt immediatly after Antichriſt, Chriſt ſhall come, *viz.* there ſhalbe a very little tyme betwixt them: and the fraudes and deceiptes of Antichriſt, which were begun to be deſtroyed by *Helias* and *Henoch*, ſhalbe wholy deſtroyed by the comming of Chriſt himſelfe, and the fearefull ſignes which ſhall goe before. III.

Finally wee haue the ſame 1. *Ioan.* 2. *My children it is the laſt houre, and as you haue heard, that Antichriſt commeth, and now there are many become Antichriſts, whereby we know that it is the laſt houre.* Where *S. Iohn* ſaith that this tyme from Chriſt to the end of the world, is the laſt houre, that is, the laſt tyme, or the laſt age, as *S. Auguſtine* expoundeth it: and he proueth it excellētly out of this principle, becauſe wee knovv that Antichriſt ſhall come in the end of the vvorld. For *S. Iohn* maketh this argument. Wee knovv that Antichriſt ſhall come in the end of the vvorld: but now wee ſee many of his forerunners, or little Antichriſts preſent; wherfore it is a certayne ſigne, that this is the laſt houre or age. As one might argue of the houre laſt of the night: wee know that the ſunne ſhall riſe in the end of the night: but now we ſee many of his beames enlighten the aire, wherefore wee know that this is the laſt houre of the night. IIII.

To conclude, the ſame is confirmed by the common conſent of the Fathers *Iren. l. 5. in fine*, *Tertul. l. de reſurrect.* *Augu-* V.

« *August. l. 2. ciu. cap. 19.* & others; & by our Aduersaries cõfessiõ: « for our Aduersaries acknowledge, that Antichrist shall raigne to the end of the world, and therfore a little after his « destructiõ, the end of the world shalbe. From this figure then, « togeather with the former, we haue inuincible demõstra- « tion, by which it is proued, that Antichrist is not yet come, « nor is the Bishop of *Rome*. For if forthwith after the death « of Antichrist the world shalbe ended; and Antichrist « shall not liue after he hath appeared, and begun to reigne, « but 3. yeares and a halfe: then he shal not appeare, nor be- « gin to reigne, but three yeares & a halfe before the worldes « end. But the Pope hath already reigned with both swordes, « euen in the opinion of our Aduersaries, aboue 500. yeares, & « yet the world endureth still.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downam* first cauelleth with *Bellarmine* because he will not proue that Antichrist *is not yet come*, but only, *that he is not come long since*. As though *Bellarmine* had taken vpon him to fight with the wind, and not to impugne *M. Downam*, and his fellowes, who affirme, that Antichrist came long since. Wherfore this shift will not serue his turne, but he must either yield himselfe, or answere the argument, which he will do very substantially with a distinction, that *the comming of Antichrist, and his death*, are two thinges; so that though it be true, that *he is not vtterly to be destroyed before the second comming of Christ*, yet he came euen in the Apostles tymes, as *S. Paul insinuateth, and S. Iohn plainely teacheth*. VVhere we must put *M. Downam* in mynd, that these two Apostles only teach, that Antichrist came in their tyme only in his forerunners, but now we seeke for him in persõ, or as *M. Downam* speaketh κατ' ἐξοχὴν, in which sort, he and his fellowes make him to haue raigned a 1000. yeares vvhich *Bellarmine* impugneth, because presently after his destruction the world must end, and he shalbe destroyed within 3. yeares and a halfe after his being in that height, and consequently the world should haue ben ended 1000. yeares

I.

The end of the world shal not be lõg after Antichrists cõming.

yeares since, if the Protestants opinio about the tyme of Antichrists comming in that sort were true.

In the Protestats opinion the world should haue byn ended many hundred yeares since.

2. Fayne would *M. Downam* weaken *Bellarmines* proofes, by telling vs, that some are not to be vnderstood of Antichrist *Dan.* 7. *Apoc.* 20. *Matth.* 24. 14. but we haue proued the contrary at large in diuers places, to which the Readers may haue recourse. Others, sayth *M. Downam*, are against himselfe, *Dan.* 12. out of which he draweth these consequences. 1. *that the raigne of Antichrist is not iust* 3. *yeares and a halfe, but* 1290. *daies*. But we haue already giuen the reason, why the last moneth that Antichrist shall liue, is not accoumpted in his raigne. 2. *that Antichrist shalbe destroyed before the end of the world. VVheras Paul telleth vs, that Christ shall destroy him at his appearing, & not* 45. *daies before.* But *M. Downam* should haue noted, that *S. Paul* maketh two degrees of the destruction of Antichrist: first his particuler death by Christs speciall commaundment, or apparition: & secondly the destruction of his Kingdome by his comming, and the signes which shall go before.

I. II.

See chap. 4. 5. 7.

Dan. 12.

M. Downams third inference is, that the day of iudgment shalbe certainly knowne after Antichristes reuealing: but of this we haue said inough before, that there is no doubt, but that the day of iudgment may be knowne when God reuealeth it, though the wicked will not vnderstand it so neither, as *Daniel* affirmeth: by which *M. Downams* last inference is also answered, and the Papists will prooue true, by following Christ and his Prophets, when *M. Downam* and his companions must needes be lyers, leauing either of them, though they protest neuer so much, to cleaue to the other.

2. *Thes.* 2.

2. degrees of Antichrists destruction.

3. After this he commeth to *Matth.* 24. 29. where he confesseth, *that the signes of Christs comming are to follow the tribulations vnder Antichrist*; which is as much as *Bellarmine* desireth at his handes; but yet he will needes inferre out of this place also, that *Antichrist shall not be one man*, because *v.* 23. 24. our Sauiour speaketh of many false Christs, and false Prophets, which we know very well; and haue daily experience, how true it is by seeing so many sectaries in our dayes: but we also know, that euery false Christ or false Prophet is not Antichrist, though we will not deny, but that he shalbe a false Christ, and a false Prophet also; yea the falsest of

Matth. 24.

them all. But what is this to the purpose, to proove that he shall not be one man? Next he commeth to 2. *Thess.* 2. where he repeateth his distinction of Antichrists comming and ending, but to as little purpose as before, though he explicateth many Chymericall degrees more largely, which so farre as they make against vs, are elswhere confuted. Lastly he commeth to the 1. *Ioan.* 2. where he impugneth the argument that *Bellarmine* frameth out *S. Iohn*, making him proove, that it is now the last houre, because wee see many petite Antichrists. For, saith *M. Downam*, by the like reason *wee might proove, that the fulnes of tyme was from the beginning, because there were alway Prophets, which Bellarmine calleth the forerunners of Christ*. But *M. Downam* should haue considered, that it is not absolutely true, that it is the fulnes of time, whensoeuer it may be said that Christ commeth, but only when he commeth in person, and therfore it is no meruaile, though he commeth in his forerunners frō the beginning of the world, and yet the fulnes of tyme was not come; but Antichrist cannot be said to come at all, but only in the last houre, and therfore *S. Iohn* proueth verie well, that it was the last houre, because Antichrist was already come in his members and forerunners.

IV. 1. *Iohn* 2.

Antichrist cannot be said to come at al but in the last houre.

After he hath thus checked *Bellarmine* for framing of *S. Iohns* argument, *M. Downam* taketh vpon him to put it in forme himselfe. This then (in his opinion) is the Apostles reason. *VVhen the Antichrist commeth, it is the last houre. Now, saith he, Antichrists are come (meaning by Antichrists, the same with the Antichrist, which elswhere he affirmeth was then entred into the world, or els there are 4. termini, 4. termes in the Apostles argument:) Therfore now is the last houre.* But in this manner *S. Iohns* argument should not only haue 4. but 5. termes. For Antichrist, and Antichrists are not all one, nor commeth, and are come; to omit that the wordes of *S. Iohn* be *(are become.)* Wherfore *M. Downam* sheweth himselfe a verie poore Logitian, if he can frame no better arguments then this. Neither can wee belieue him whē he telleth vs, *that the Antichrist and Antichrists are all one in S. Iohn*: for besides, that the article is put only in one place as hath ben noted before, why should *S. Iohn* change both number and phrase, and so obscure his sentence, if there were

Downam peruerteth S. Io. text & argumēt.

were no difference in the thing it ſelfe? And if *M. Downam* would be aſhamed to ſpeake thus abſurdly himſelfe, much greater cauſe hath he to bluſh for attributing ſo groſſe an abſurdity to *S. Io.* or rather to the *Holy Ghoſt* who ſpeaketh in him. And by this it is plaine that in theſe few wordes of *S. Io.* there are conteyned two arguments, if wee will reduce them to forme, as before I haue ſhewed, and *Bellarmine* ſup- *Chap.* 2. poſeth in this place.

4. But at length, though *M. Downam* cauilleth with *Bellarmines* proofes in this ſort, omitting the authoritie of the Fathers altogeather, yet he granteth his concluſion, that Antichriſt ſhall raigne *or continue vntill the end of the world*, & likwiſe acknowledgeth, that if the former argumẽt cõcluded (which I willingly remit to the Readers cenſure) then this demonſtration is likewiſe vnanſwerable, which is that, that *Bellarmine* pretended in this whole Chapter. Neither doth *M. Downãs* diſtinction, which he repeateth heere againe of *Antichriſts comming and end*, any whit auayle him: for *Bellarmine* proued in the former argumẽt, that Antichriſt was not to continue in his kingdome paſt three yeares and a halfe, and in this, that the world was to end very ſhortly after him, by which it is euident, that it cannot bee a 1000. yeares, ſince he began his raigne, as *M. Downam* and his mates affirme. I.

The other obiection, which hee maketh concerning the length of Antichriſts raigne, is a meere cauill: for *Bellarmine* in his whole diſcourſe ſufficiently explicateth in what ſenſe he ſaith, that Antichriſt ſhall not begin his raigne but 3. yeares and a halfe before the end, *viz.* before the end begin, for he taketh not the end for the very laſt inſtant, but for that ſpace in which God ſhall begin to confound Antichriſt, and deſtroy his kingdome; which in all wilbe 75. daies, as *Daniel* foretelleth, which ſpace helpeth *M. Downams* cauſe very little, who hath need of manie tymes ſo many yeares, to make his poſition good, that Antichriſt came 1000. yeares ſince, and yet the world indureth: and that this was *Bellarmines* mind, he himſelfe hath now ſufficiently explicated in *recognit. operum pag.* 18. where he noteth, that he ſaid that Antichriſt ſhall not appeare, nor begin to

The ẽd of the world is not ôly the laſt inſtant.

raigne but 3. yeares and a halfe before the end of the world, becauſe the ſpace betwixt the death of Antichriſt, & the end of the world, ſhalbe ſo little, that it may be accompted nothing: for otherwiſe he had not forgotten, that he had proued a little before, that there ſhould be 45. daies betwixt the death of Antichriſt, and the end of the world, out of *Dan.* 12. And thus we will conclude theſe 6. demonſtrations which make *Bellarmines* third argument, and deſire the Reader to conſider attentiuely, whether *Bellarmines* proofes, or *M. Downams* ſolutions, be more ſubſtantiall; and vvhat is to be thought of ſuch men as will open their mouthes in ſuch blaſphemous manner, againſt all authority & reaſon, in a matter of this importance, vpon vvhich al other queſtions in controuerſy in great part depend.

THE

THE TENTH CHAPTER.

Of Antichriſts name.

THERE followeth (ſaith *Bellarmine*) the fourth diſputation of the proper name & characters of Antichriſt. All acknowledg that thoſe wordes of *S. Io. Apoc.* 13. do certainly belong to Antichriſt: *And he ſhal make all, little with great, rich and poore, free men and ſlaues, to haue a character in their right hand, or vpon their foreheades, and that none can buy or ſell, vnles he hath the character, or name of the beaſt, or the number of his name. Heere is wiſdome, let him that hath vnderſtanding reckon the number of the beaſt, for it is the number of a man, and his number* 666. I.

There are many opinions of this number. The firſt is, that by this number, not the name, but the tyme of the comming and death of Antichriſt is deſigned: ſo houldeth *Bullēger*, who *præfat. Hom. in Apoc.* thinketh, that the tyme of Antichriſts comming is ſignifyed. In like manner the *Magdeburgenſes*, who *cent. 1. l. 2. c. 4.* thinke, that the tyme of Antichriſts death is deſigned. Likevviſe others, vvho as vvitneſſeth *Cliſtouevs in l. 4. Damaſceni c. 28.* thinke, that the death of *Mahomet* is deſigned, vvhom they ſay was Antichriſt: vvith vvhome agreeth *Lyranus* vpon this place, though he thinketh not, that *Mahomet* vvas Antichriſt; yet he imagineth that by this number is ſignifyed, that the death of *Mahomet* vvas to bee in the yeare 666. from Chriſts comming. II.

« This is a most absurde opinion. First because *S. Iohn* « saith, that he speaketh of the number of the Beastes name. « Secondly because the beast, whose nũber this is, will com- « maund all Merchants to vse it for a signe in contracts, as « is manifest *Apoc.* 13. Wherfore it is not the number of the « death of the Beast, but belongeth to him aliue. Thirdly, « because it is also false, that *Mahomet* died the yeare of Christ « 666. For some say he died in the yeare 637. as *Matthew Palmer*: « some the yeare 630. as *Cedrenus in compend. hist.* some the yeare « 628. as *Ioan. Vasæus in chronico Hispaniæ*.

IV. « The second opinion is of *David Chytræus in cap.* 13. « *Apoc.* who saith the name of Antichrist is λατεῖνος, or in the « Hebrew *Romiith*, *Romanus*. Therfore the Pope, who is a « latin Prynce, since he ruleth in *Latium*, and is the Bishop « of *Rome*, is Antichrist. The same teacheth *Theodorus Bibliander* « *tab.* 10. and therfore he maketh the inscription of the 11. « table of his Cronologie, which beginneth at the yeare 600. « *Latinos Papa*. Their reasons are two: the first, because *S. Ire-* « *naeus lib.* 5. teacheth, that it is very like, that this shalbe the « name of Antichrist. The other, because indeed the letters « of his name make that number, as is manifest.

Resc.	200.	λ.	30.	τ.	300.
Vau.	6.	α.	1.	ι.	5.
Mem.	40.	τ.	300.	ν.	10.
Iod.	10.	ι.	5.	τ.	300.
Iod.	10.	ν.	10.	α.	1.
Tau.	400.	ο.	50.	ς.	50.
		ε.	70.		
		ς.	200.		
	666.		666.		666.

V. « This opinion is altogether temerarious: for first « *Irenæus* saith indeed, that the name λατεῖνος may probablie be « applyed to Antichrist; but he addeth, that it is much more « probable, that Antichrists name shall not be λατεῖνος, but τειτὰ, « which also expresseth that number: and is a far more noble

VI. « name, since it signifieth the *Sunne*.

« Besides *Irenæus* his coniecture which might haue some « probabilitie then, now hath none: for he saith, that it is

pro-

probable, that Antichriſt ſhalbe called *Latinus*, not becauſe he ſhall rule in *Latio*, but becauſe in his tyme the *Latines* had greateſt dominions, and in a manner the whole world. For becauſe Antichriſt ſhalbe a moſt potẽt King, without doubt he ſhal poſſeſſe the moſt potent kingdomes, which he ſhall find at his comming: but the moſt potent kingdome is that of the *Latines*, ſaith *Ireneus*, for they now moſt truelie raigne. Surely this coniecture now is nothing worth: for the *Latines* raigne no longer ouer all the world, but the *Turkes* are thoſe which moſt truly raigne, and among vs the *Spaniards* and *French*, not the *Latines*.

VII. Moreouer the name of *Latin*, as it ſignifieth a *Roman*, is not written with (α) but with a ſimple *Iota*, and then it maketh not that number. In which manner the deuiſe of the name *Romiith* may likewiſe be confuted. For *Romanus* cannot end in *Tau*, ſince it is the maſculine gender, for that it is the termination of the Feminine gender among the hebrews: but if wee remoue the letter *Tau*, there want 400. to make the number of Antichriſt. Likewiſe the name λατῖνος, if it be the name of Antichriſt, it ſhalbe proper to him, as *Arethas* teacheth, and his moſt vſuall name, for it muſt be ſhewed for a ſigne by all that buy and ſell. But the name λατῖνος is common; for there was neuer any Pope, that by his proper name was called *Latinus*. Neither is this an vſuall name, for the Popes neuer call themſelues *Latines*, but *Biſhops*, or *Popes* The name *Romanus* was proper to one only Pope, who notwithſtanding could not be Antichriſt, ſince he liued but 4. moneths, and otherwiſe it is a common name.

VIII. Finally, if only this name λατῖνος, or *Romanus*, made the number 666. our Aduerſaries ſaid ſomething: but there are innumerable names, which make the ſame number. *Hippolytus Martyr in orat. de conſummatione mundi*, noted another name which maketh the ſame number, *viz.* ἀρνοῦμαι, that is *nego*, I deny. *Arethas* named ſeauen, λαμπρίνης, id eſt, *Illuſtris*. τιτὰν, id eſt, *Sol*. ὁ νικητὴς, id eſt, *Victor*. Κακὸς ὁδηγὸς, id eſt, *prauus dux*. ἀληθῶς ἔλαβες, id eſt, *verè nocens*. πάλαι ἔδοκαν, id eſt, *olim inuidem*. ἄμνος ἄδικος, id eſt, *agnus nocens*. *Primaſius* addeth another, ἀντίμος, id eſt, *contrarius*. *Rupertus*, and before him *Haymo* inuented

« uented two other, *viz.* γενσεως, which is a *Gethes* name, &, « DIC LVX, a Latin; which maketh 666. if after the Latin « manner we take D. for 500. I. for one, C. for 100. L. for 50. « V. for 5. and X. for 10.

IX. « Of the later writers *Lindanus l. 3. Dubitantij*, noteth, that « *Martyn Lauter* maketh the number 666. if the Latin letters be « taken for numbers after the manner of the Greeke and He- « brew thus: A. 1. B. 2. C. 3. D. 4. E. 5. F. 6. G. 7. H. 8. I. 9. « K. 10. L. 20. M. 30. N. 40. O. 50. P. 60. Q. 70. R. 80. S. 90. « T. 100. V. 200. X. 300. Y. 400. Z. 500. *Gilbert Genebrard* in the « last booke of his Cronologie noted also, that the name of *Lu-* « *ther* in hebrew, maketh that nũber *Luter*. I add two more in « fauour of *Luther* & *Chytræus*, to wit, *Dbid Citriu*, id est, *Dauid* « *Chytræus*, and κακος, which later agreeth aswell to *Luther*, « as the name *Latinus* to the Pope.

«	*Daleth.*	4.	ρ.	200.
«	*Beth.*	2.	π.	2.
«	*Iod.*	10.	ξ.	60.
«	*Daleth.*	4.	ο.	70.
«	*Caph.*	20.	ν.	50.
«	*Iod.*	10.	ι.	5.
«	*Tau.*	400.	ι.	10.
«	*Resc.*	200.	ο.	70.
«	*Iod.*	10.	ε.	200.
«	*Vau.*	6.		
«		666.		666.

X. « The third opinion is of many Catholikes, who ghesse « that Antichrist shalbe called ἀνισος. because this name pro- « perly agreeth vnto him, and conteyneth exactly that num- « ber. So affirme *Primasius*, *Anselmus*, and *Richardus*.

« This opinion is well confuted by *Rupertus*, because the « name which *S. Iohn* insinuateth in this place, shall not be gi- « uen to Antichrist by his Aduersaries, but taken by himselfe, « as glorying therin, insomuch that he shall make it be writ- « ten in mens foreheades. And yt is not probable, that he will « take to himselfe any hatefull or vile name, such as ἀνισος, « and almost all the other aboue rehearsed.

The

The 4. opinion is of *Rupertus* himselfe, who thinketh XI.
that the name of Antichrist is not signified by this number, »
but a triple preuarication of the Diuell to be fulfilled in An- »
tichrist: for the number of 6. becausse it commeth not to 7. »
in which is rest and happynes, is the number of a creature »
by preuarication falling from rest. And the Diuell hath »
incurred a threefold preuarication, or rather hath tripled »
one. For first he preuaricated when he sinned in himselfe: »
after againe when he made the first man sinne, and then to »
6. he added 60. Thirdly he shall preuaricate, when he »
shall seduce the whole world by Antichrist, and then to 60. »
he shall adde 600. »

The fifth opinion is *Bedes*, who taketh the contrary »
course, and teacheth that the number of 6. is perfect, be- XII.
cause God made heauen and earth in 6. dayes, and 60. more »
perfect, and 600. most perfect. Whereupon he gathereth »
that Antichrist is designed by the number 666. because he »
shall vsurpe to himselfe the most perfect tribute, which is »
only due to God. In figure wherof we read *lib. 3. Reg. cap.* »
10. that the weight of gold which was brought euery yeare »
to *Salomon* was 666000. talents. These two opinions seeme »
not sufficiently to agree with that which *S. Iohn* saith, »
that, that number is the number of the name, not of the »
dignity or preuarication: neither would these Fathers haue »
their opinions otherwise accompted of, then as suspicions, »
and coniectures. »

Wherefore their opinion is trueſt who confesse their »
ignorance, and say, that Antichrists name is yet vnknown, XIII.
which is the opinion of *S. Ireneus* vpon this place of the »
Apocalyps, and of others. And I will set downe *S. Irenæus* his »
words, becausse *Chytræus* exhorteth his reader to peruse them. »
I exhort (saith he) *the studious Reader to peruse the last pages of* I- »
renæus *vpon this place, which are the* 333. *and the* 334. *who disputeth of this number of the Beast modestly, and piously, and among other* »
things sheweth, that Antichrist shalbe a Latin or Roman by the name »
λατῖνος &c. Wherefore *Ireneus* saith thus: *It is therfore more cer-* »
tayne, and without danger to expect the fulfilling of the Prophesy, then to »
suspect or ghesse at any names, since there may be many names found which »
haue the foresaid number. And notwithstanding there remayneth the »

» same question; for if we find many names, which haue this number, the
» question is which of them he shall beare that is to come. Neither doe we
» say this, for any scarsity of names which haue the number of his name,
» but for the feare of God, and zeale of truth: for the name Εὐάνθας hath
» the number we seeke; but we affirme nothing of it. Likewise the name
» λατεῖνος hath the number 666. and is very likely, because this name
» hath the truest Kingdome, for the Latins are they which raigne now.
» But we will not boast of this. But τειτὰν hauing the first syllable written
» by the two greeke vowells ε, & ι, is the name which deserueth most credit
» of all, that are found in our language &c. And after. Since therefore
» this name Titan hath so many perswasions, and so great likelyhood, that
» we may gather by many thinges, that peraduenture he that is to come,
» shalbe called Titan; yet we will not hazard our selues in it, nor affirme
» with asseueration, that he shall haue this name, because if his name were
» to be publikely manifested at this tyme, doubtlesse it would haue byn
» declared by him, who saw the Reuelation. So he.

XIIII. Wherefore let Chytraeus giue eare to Irenaeus disputing modestly, piously, and learnedly, and let him not falsly impute that vnto him, which he neuer sayd. For Irenaeus did not thinke, that Antichrist should be a Latin or a Roman, but he saith, and repeateth oftener then once, that the name of Antichrist cannot be knowne yet, and this he also proueth by two very good reasons. First, because there be many names, which make that number, neither can we ghesse which of them is that which is foretould. Secondly, because if God would haue had it knowne at this tyme, certainly he would haue reuealed it by S. Iohn himselfe. And he added that he did not speake thus for any want of names, but for the feare of God, and zeale of the truth. For which cause he rehearsed three names Εὐάνθας, λατεῖνος, & τειτὰν, of which he affirmed that the second was more likely then the first, and the third then the second, but that none of them was certaine.

XV. We may also adde a third reason out of the same Irenaeus: for a little before disputing against them, which gathered false names of Antichrist, out of their owne conceipt, he saith, that they fall into many inconueniences, for they expose themselues to the danger of erring, and of deceauing others, and of causing both themselues and many others to

be

be moſt eaſily ſeduced by Antichriſt. For when he ſhall » come, and haue another name then they perſwade them- » ſelues he ſhall haue, he ſhall not be held by them to be An- » tichriſt, and conſequently ſhall not be auoyded. All which » inconueniences will doubtles happen to the *Lutherans*, and » eſpecially this laſt, for becauſe they haue perſwaded them- » ſelues that the Pope is Antichriſt, when that true Antichriſt » ſhall come, he will not eaſily be diſcerned by them, and » therefore not auoyded. »

But heere we muſt note, that Antichriſts name wilbe XVI. » moſt manifeſt when he is come, for likewiſe before Chriſt » came, the Iewes knew not certainely how he ſhould be » called, although the Prophets had foretould many thinges » of his name. Yea one of the *Sybills* (as we find in the firſt » booke of their verſes) had noted the number of Chriſts name » and ſaid that it was 888. as *S. Iohn* wrote of Antichriſt, » that the number of his name is 666. And yet vntill Chriſts » comming men knew not, that he was to be called Ieſus. » But ſince Chriſts comming all controuerſy is taken away, » and all know that he is called Ieſus. »

The Sybills verſes are theſe	ι.	10.	»
Sed quæ ſit numeri totius ſumma docebo.	η.	8.	»
Namque octo monadas, totidem decadas ſuper iſtas	σ.	200.	»
atque hecatontadas octo, infidis ſignificabit	ο.	70.	»
Humanis nomen, tu verò mente teneto.	υ.	400.	»
To this we may adde, that it is com-	ς.	200.	XVII.
mon to all Propheſies to be doubtfull and		888.	»
obſcure, till they be fulfilled, as *S. Irenæus*			»
rightly teacheth and proueth *lib. 4. c. 43.*			»

Hence we may take an inſoluble argument to proue XVIII. » that the Pope is not Antichriſt, and that Antichriſt is not » yet come. For if Antichriſt were come, and were the B. of » *Rome*, there would be no queſtion of his name, foretould by » *S. Iohn*, as becauſe our Chriſt is come, there is now no » queſtion euen amonſt the Turkes, Iewes, and Pagans, how » he is called. But there is very great Controuerſy about the » name of Antichriſt, as is manifeſt by ſo many opinions as » we haue rehearſed and refuted. Wherefore the Propheſy of » *S. Iohn* is not yet fulfilled, and conſequently Antichriſt is »

» not yet come, neither is the Pope Antichrist.

XIX. Adde a confirmation out of the confession of *Augustinus Marloratus*, who in his great explication vpon the new Testament, gathered out of diuers *Lutheran* and *Calumist* wryters, saith thus of this place: *There are almost as many expositions, as expositours of this place: by which it appeareth, that it is most obscure and darke.* Thus he. But if this Prophesy be still most obscure and darke, it is not yet fulfilled: wherefore Antichrist is not yet come; for all Prophesies are made most cleere when they are fulfilled. Why then doest thou *Marloratus* brag in thy Preface vpon the *Apoc.* that, *it is so manifest, that the Pope is Antichrist, that if you held your peace, the stones would exclaime.*

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

XVI. 1. FOR answere. First *M. Downam* deemeth, that this name of Antichrist shalbe commonly knowne so soone as he is come, and he giueth his reason, because *the name of Antichrist cannot be knowne, as the name of Antichrist, vntill Antichrist himselfe be knowne and acknowledged,* which was not to be at his first comming, *for then he could not be able to seduce many, few or none beeing so desperately mad as to follow him whome they know to be Antichrist.* But *M. Downam* should haue considered, that *Bellarmine* speaketh not of any secret comming of Antichrist, but of his reuelation and raigne, which *M. Downam* and his crew affirme to haue happened many hundred yeares since, and *Bellarmine* confuteth them by this argument, that if it were so, Antichrists name would be well knowne, as we see Christs is, and yet many are so mad, as to refuse Christ, though they know his name: and in like manner no doubt, many will imbrace Antichrist after that his name shalbe certaynely knowne.

XVIII.

Antichrists name shal be known when he is come.

2. Secondly *M. Downam* telleth vs, that *in the similitude taken from Christ there is no likenesse, because Christ was one particuler man, but Antichrist is not, but a State which cannot haue a proper name:* which as you see is no answere at all, if Antichrist shalbe one particuler man, as hath ben proued in due place, to

See. chap. 2.

which

which I remit my Reader: and besides I see no reason why a State may not haue a proper name also. Yet M. *Downam* giueth vs another difference, for that *Christ comming to saue, his name Iesus, the name of the Sauiour was to be made knowne, that he might the rather be imbraced: Antichrist comming to deceaue, and to destroy was (according to his diuellish policy) to conceale that name, whereby he should be knowne to be Antichrist*; where you must marke how cunningly M. *Downam* concealeth the diligence which the Diuell vsed to obscure the name of Christ, and likewise the power and wisdome of God to make Antichrist knowne, for otherwise his Reader would very easily haue conceyued how God is as able to manifest Antichrists name, that he may be auoyded, as he was to make our Sauiours name knowne, that he might be imbraced. And besides it is more then probable, that Antichrist will not be so humble, but that he will desire to haue his name knowne: for this is the great and powerfull wisdome of God to ouerthrow the wicked by their owne courses. Wherefore it is not certayn, that Antichrist shall either know, or make accompt of this Prophesy, nor reflect vpon his name, whether it conteyneth this number or no. But though all this should be so, yet he will thinke to ouercome this difficulty, aswell as the rest, especially when he is come to that height of pryde to extoll himselfe aboue all that is called God. And sure we are, that by one meanes or other his name shalbe manifest, for otherwise this reuelation of *S. Iohn* concerning it, would serue to small purpose. M. Downams iugling.

After this M. *Downam* maketh a litle digression from his purpose to tell vs, *that the Sybil did not only foretell, that our Sauiours name should conteyne the number 888. but also, by certayne Acrostiches foretould that he should be Iesus Christ, the sonne of God and Sauiour. But of Antichrist she speaketh nothing so playnly: howbeit she calleth Rome Babylon as Io. doth. And in the 8. booke describing Antichrist as some thinke, she calleth him a Prince with many heads*: which M. *Downam* will haue to be vnderstood, *either by a Metonymie for the Popes triple crowne, or by a Synechdoche for the succession of Popes*. Likewise the *Sybil* addeth, that he shall haue *a name neere to Ponti, that is Pontifex, the Pope*, saith M. *Downam*. Now how *Rome* is *Babylon* we shall see afterward. And as for that The Sybills verses of Adrian are expounded.

thought of some, it is euident, that not Antichrist, but *Adrian* the Emperour is spoken of in those verses, in which among other things, his little God *Aninous* is described. Neither is he called a Prince with many heads, as *M. Downam* supposeth, but is only sayd to haue one white, or gray head, as *Spartianus* testifieth in his life, that *Adrian* had, and that either by these verses of the *Sybil*, or by those of *Virgil*, in which he describeth *Numa Pompilius*, by his gray head also, *Aeneid. 6. Nosco crines, incanaq; menta, Adrian* prognosticated that he should come to be Emperour. *Bullenger* and *Castalio* differ from *M. Downam*, and the truth also; for they will not haue it to be a white head, but a white hat, or helmet, deriuing it rather from τὸ κράνος, then τὸ κράνον, contrary to the common vse of such compounds. But euen by *Castalio* his consent, he that in this 8. booke is by the *Sybil* called πολιόκρανος, in the fifth booke is also named ἀργυρόκρανος, in which place he is expressely sayd to succeed *Traian*, as *Adrian* did. And in both places he is sayd to haue a name neare to the sea, which in greeke is called πόντος, in respect of the Adriatike sea, which was denominated of a Citty called *Adria*, neere *Venice*, in which this Emperour was also borne, and from thence had his name *Adrianus*. That other conceypt of *M. Downam*, who thinketh that this name neere to *Ponti*, is *Pontifex*, is very farre fetched; for what connexion is there betwixt πόντος in greeke, and *Pons* in latin? especially since that *Pontifex* is no greeke word, and the *Sybil* wrote in that language, and consequently the name which she spake of, must not be only among Latins. Finally, if we should admit this fond conceipt, yet all might be applyed to this Emperour; who, as *Platina* writeth in vita *Alexandri*, repayred one bridge at *Athens*, and built another at *Rome* of his owne name, and besides was consecrated Bishop of *Ceres*; but this refuge is needlesse, since we haue the former most manifest explication. I haue stood longer vpon this, then was necessary, since that *M. Downam* confesseth, that it is from the purpose, to which now he promiseth to returne.

See Florimond Reymond of Antichrist cap. 22.

XVII. 3. And he goeth about to answere *Bellarmines* other proofe, which is, that Prophesies are obscure till they be fulfilled, and cleere when they are fulfilled; and his answere is,

is, *that although they become more cleere after then before; yet many tymes they remayne darke and obscure to very many*. And he exemplifieth *in the Propheſies of Chriſt, which are cleere to good Chriſtians, but not to the Iewes*; and confeſſeth, *that many Propheſies concerning Antichriſt are plainely vnderſtood of the true Profeſſors, yet they ſeeme darke and obſcure to the followers of Antichriſt*. Where me thinkes he granteth all that which he denyed before, viz. that the name of Antichriſt being once come, ſhall be aſwell knowne, as that of Chriſt: and beſides, he openly gainſayeth *Marloratus*, who affirmeth, that euen among *M. Downams* true Profeſſors, *there are as many expoſitions, as expoſitors of this place*. And beſides *Bellarmine* ſheweth, that euen the Iewes, Turkes, and Pagans graunt, that the name of our Chriſt is *Ieſus*, which manifeſtly conteyneth the number 888. But all Catholikes, and others are far from thinking that the Pope is to be called *Romanus*, and *Latinus*, except ſomething els be added; and beſides theſe names conteyne not iuſtly the number 666. as *Bellarmine* proueth. Hauing thus put off the Argument, *M. Downam* maketh another digreſſion, taking hould of the former part of *Bellarmines* propoſition, that propheſies till they be fulfilled are (for the moſt part) darke and ambiguous: and heereupon he inferreth, that therefore *the writinges of the Fathers, who lyued before Antichriſt, were moſt vncertayne gheſſes in their expoſitions of the Propheſies concerning him*: which illation we deny, and rather inferre the quyte contrary, that ſince the Propheſies are obſcure, and ambiguous, we had the more need to take ſome light and certainty from the Fathers writings, who receaued their expoſitions from the light of Gods ſpirit, and the certainty of the Apoſtles Traditions. But *M. Downam* proueth his inferrence by *Bellarmines* confeſſion, euen in this Chapter, and cyteth his wordes in the margent. *Sed nec iſti Patres voluerunt ſententias illas ſuas alio loco haberi, quàm ſuſpicionum & cõiecturarum*. Neither would theſe Fathers haue thoſe their opinions otherwiſe accompted of, then as ſuſpicions, and coniectures; which aſſertion of *Bellarmine* commeth far ſhort of *M. Downams* poſition, for he ſpeaketh only of two Fathers *Rupertus* and *Beda*, *M. Downam* ſpeaketh in generall of all the Fathers; *Bellarmine* calleth only theſe two particuler opinions

M. Downam contradicteth himſelfe & Marloratus.

The neceſſity of the Fathers expoſitions.

ons of theirs, ſuſpicions and coniectures: *M. Downam* would prone, that all the opinions of all the Fathers concerning propheſies not fulfilled, are but gheſſes, which is to proue an vniuerſall by a particuler; a fit argument for *M. Downams* Diuinity, if not for his Logick, which perhappes the badnes of his Diuinity maketh him either to forget or forſake. The like fault he committeth againe in alleaging *S. Irenæus*, who only ſpeaketh of this one propheſy of Antichriſts name: and *Andreas* maketh as little to his purpoſe, only affirming with *Bellarmine*, that experience will make manyfeſt to them that are vigilant, both the exact computation of this number, and all other thinges which are written of Antichriſt; which *M. Downam* ſeemed before to deny, and now is as far from prouing, that the Fathers expoſitions when they all agree, make not a Propheſy certainely to be vnderſtood; though when they are deuyded, their expoſitions be but probable, and therefore, becauſe they were ſo in this place, we ſee that *Bellarmine* grounded not his argument vpon any of them, but vpon another certayne rule, which they all agree in, and *M. Downam* himſelfe cannot chooſe, but confeſſe in great part.

Downam proueth an vniuerſall by a particuler.

The auctority of the Fathers.

XVIII. 4. Thus much for this digreſſion. Now *M. Downam* commeth againe to the purpoſe, & goeth about to anſwere *Bellarmines* Aſſumption; which is, that Antichriſts name is yet vnknowne, where *M. Downam* diſtinguiſheth, confeſſing that *in the Church of Rome, it is not knowne of the ignorant, nor acknowledged of the obſtinate; but in the true Church of God Antichriſt is knowne, and his name acknowledged*. But *Marloratus* affirmeth the contrary, and *M. Downam* inſinuateth as much ſaying, that to the opinions which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth many more might be added: which he will hardly make good, except he haue recourſe to his new Ghoſpellers, who though they be vnited in malyce againſt the Pope, yet their proud heads cannot agree in the expoſition of this, or almoſt any other place of Scripture. And beſides the agreement of Proteſtants in this or in any thing els muſt needs be of little accompt, except they could bring better proofes, that they are the true Church of God: which affirmation whilſt it be proued is *petitio principij*, and the Iewes, Turkes, and Pagans will ſay

Antichriſts name yet vnknowne.

Downam contradicteth him ſelfe and Marloratus.

ſay aſmuch for themſelues, if any man wilbe ſo fooliſh as to beliue them, which he hath reaſon to doe aſſoone as heretikes, of which number to vs, it ſeemeth euident, that Proteſtants are.

XIII. XIIII. XV.

5. Next M. *Downam* maketh *Bellarmine* to proue, that Antichriſts name is not yet knowne by the authority of *Irenæus*, which he impugneth, becauſe *Irenæus liued before the fulfilling of this Propheſy*, which he affirmeth to be *now fulfilled*; Which obiection I thinke deſerues no other name then the former; for it is a playne *petitio principij*. And M. *Downam* might eaſily haue diſcerned, that *Bellarmine* was in that place diſcuſſing and ſearching out the moſt probable opinion among Catholikes, who all agree, that Antichriſt is not yet come no more then he was in *Irenæus* his tyme, and therfore his authority among them proueth very well, that his name is not yet knowne. As for M. *Downam* and his Mates, who haue forſaken the Catholike Church and faith, he argueth againſt them from their owne authority, and manifeſt experience, as we haue ſeene. Wherefore all *Irenæus* his proofes are good and firme for the end that *Bellarmine* bringeth them, as likewiſe his inference is euident to all Catholikes, that the Proteſtants are in great danger to receaue Antichriſt when he commeth, ſince before he come they ſo verily perſwade themſelues that he is already come, which is a good warning for Proteſtants alſo to looke about them, and to take heed, that they be not ſo confident, but vpon better groundes, for the daunger is great. But here I muſt deſire my Reader to marke attentiuely M. *Downams* deuiſe, who will needes be ſo fooliſh as to ſeeme to thinke, that the proofes which *Bellarmine* bringeth to conuince that *Irenæus* was of that opinion, that Antichriſts name ſhould not be certainely knowne before his coming, were brought by him to proue abſolutely againſt Proteſtants that Antichriſts name is yet vnknowne: whereas he beginneth not to propoſe his argument to this purpoſe, till he had fully examined both *Irenæus*, and all the other opinions.

M. Downams Petitio principij.

The danger of Proteſtãts

M. Downam miſtaketh Bellarmine.

6. Well, you muſt giue M. *Downam* leaue to miſtake ſometymes, otherwiſe he ſhould haue very little to ſay to the purpoſe: Yet he wil try what he can ſay to *Bellarmines*

true proofe; which is, that Antichrists name is not yet knowne, because there is a great controuersy about it. Against which he obiecteth: that *by the same reason Bellarmine may conclude, that few pointes of religion are yet knowne, because there be few, concerning which there is no controuersy.* But *M. Downam* must consider the difference, which is great. For first about Antichrists name, there is not only a question betwixt Catholikes and Protestants, but likewise euen Protestants themselues doe vary, and Catholikes also are not all of one opinion, which *M. Downam* insinuateth in some sort, saying, that *in other controuersies the truth is knowne of those which are Orthodoxall, howsoeuer others will not acknowledge it.* But of this matter he dareth not go so farre, but only aduentureth to say, that *he doubteth not, but that the truth of it is knowne, although some cannot, and others will not as yet see it.* So that in this, some cannot know the truth but in other controuersies, all may that will. And besides *M. Downam* might haue noted, that not only the Orthodoxall, but all others must know and acknowledge Antichrists name thus farre, that they confesse, that he whome the Orthodoxall take to be Antichrist hath that name which hath this number of 666. as all Pagans, Turkes, and Iewes confesse, that the name of Iesus, which Christians hould to be the name of Christ, is indeed the name of our Christ, and contayneth the number 888. But heere it is otherwise; for though *M. Downam* and his fellowes giue the Pope the name of *Romanus* and *Latinus*: yet neither the Popes themselues, nor any other giue them that name without addition, especially that of *Latin* cannot be attributed to him, for he is head as well of the *Greeke* as the *Latin* Church: & his particuler Sea or Bishoprick, to which this supreme iurisdiction is annexed, is only *Rome*. And besides there is much controuersy whether these names contayne the number 666. or no, as we shall see presently. Neither can *M. Downam* help himselfe with telling vs that without doubt the Roman State is signified by the beast, whose name contayneth this number 666. for this he knoweth is denied by vs, and his proofes wherof he braggeth are all discussed, and confuted in their due places.

M. Downam contradicteth himselfe.

The name of Latin cannot be giuen to the Pope.

7. Wherefore now let vs see, how he will confute

Bellar-

Bellarmines Answere to the reasons which *Chytræus*, and *Bibliander* bring for their opinions. And heere *Bellarmine* must be content to put vp an iniurious imputation that *M. Downam* layeth vpon him, that it *is his manner to make choyce of the easiest obiections*, omitting the harder; which is so manifest and notorious a slander, that I dare remit the iudgement to any indifferent, or morall Protestant. For no man, that hath read *Bellarmine*, can deny, but that he vrgeth all arguments against himselfe to the vttermost, in so much that it is the common censure of Protestants, that he is a good Author to be read against himselfe, because his obiections are so forcible: but their meaning is, that the Reader should stay in them, and not passe to his answers, because they are also most plaine and euident. But to come to our particuler, *M. Downam* should haue shewed vs those hard obiections of *Chytræus* and *Bibliander* which *Bellarmine* omitted; but he hath no such matter, only he writeth thus: *VVe produce three other arguments, as you haue heard*, speaking of himselfe in the plurall number, and as it seemeth vsing the same figure in numbring his arguments; for I can only find one of his owne adding, which is that the number of 666. is not the name of Antichrist himselfe, but of the former beast, which signifieth the Roman State. But how can *Bellarmine* be blamed for not answering this argument, which *M. Downam* hath framed so many yeares after his booke was written? For *Chytræus* and *Bibliander* could not vse this argument since they were not of *M. Downams* opinion in this point, but tooke that number to be vnderstood of the name of Antichrist himselfe, as all other Authors, but *M. Downam*, do also, for ought I can perceaue, since he alleadgeth none for his opinion: and indeed the matter is playne, as you may see in those places, where it is discussed at large.

Bellarmine slaūdered by Downam.

Downam contrary to his fellowes.

See cap. 5. n. 5. &c.

V.

The first reason then which *Bellarmine* answereth is the authority of *Irenæus*, to which he saith that *Irenæus* preferred another name before λατεῖνος, and *M. Downam* graunteth, that it *is true indeed, that he seemeth* to do so, and addeth, that *they build not vpon Irenæus his authority, but vpon those reasons whereupon his coniecture is grounded, which are two; the one because it is the name of that Kingdome which is figured vnder the former beast* Apoc. 13.7.

23. 7. *whose authority Antichrist was to vsurpe*: and he translateth *Irenæus* thus: *It is the name of that which most truly is called the Kingdome, for they are the Latines that now raigne*; and addeth his owne exposition, making *Irenæus* say, that *it is the name of the former Beast, spoken of Apoc.* 13. 1. *which figureth* verissimum Regnum, *that Kingdome which most truly is called a Kingdome, that is the Latin or Roman State*. All which is a plaine corruption, both of *Irenæus* his wordes, and meaning. For there can be nothing more playne, then that *Irenæus* attributeth this number to Antichrist himselfe, whome also he vnderstandeth to be signified by that former beast as commonly all other Authors doe; only he giueth a reason, why he thought it probable, that Antichrist should take that name, as *Bellarmine* truly explicateth, and withall sheweth, that though that reason might seeme to haue some force in *Irenæus* his tyme, now it hath none at all, because the Kingdome of the *Latins* is decayed since that tyme. And if *Irenæus* had thought that this name was to be attributed to a Kingdome or State, surely he had no reason to preferre the name of *Teitan* before *Lateinos*, as he did. Neither are we to make any accompt of *M. Downams* confirmation, vpon supposition that Antichrist it come, for this is his ordinary fault, and is called *petitio principij*: and his deniall, that Antichrist shalbe a most potent King, is tooto shameles, and disproued vpon diuers occasions; and in this very place, according to the best exposition, he is said to haue the power of the 4. Monarches: for the 10. Princes which shall deuyde the *Roman* Empire amongst them, shall belong to him, and he shalbe like to a Pard, and haue feete like a Beare, and a mouth like a Lyon, which are the three beastes, to which the other three Monarches are compared by *Daniel*, and lastly the Diuell signified by a *Dragon*, shall giue him his force and great power.

Apoc. 13.

Downam corrupteth Irenæus his wordes & meaning.

VI.

Antichrist shalbe a most potent King.

Dan. 7.

VII. The other reason of S. *Irenæus*, vpon which *M. Downam* now saith that he graunteth his opinion (though a little before he said it was easy to answere) is because the letters of the name λατῖνος make the number 666. to which *Bellarmine* obiecteth that the name of Latin, as it signifieth a *Roman*, is not written with *ει*, but which a simple *iota*, and then it maketh not that number. *M. Downam* answereth

that

that *the ancient Latines vsed to write and pronounce* ι, *long, by* ει, *diphthong, and the Grecians vsually expresse* ι, *long, by* ει, and he obserueth, that *S. Irenæus setting downe these two names* λατῖνος *and* τειτὰν, *as conteyning* 666. *taketh it for graunted, that* λατῖνος *may be so written; whereas of* τειτὰν *he saith that it maketh that number, if it be written with* ει, *diphthong*. For answere of all which, I reply: first, that M. *Downam* should haue shewed vs, that the ancient Latins euer wrote their owne name by ει, diphong, which I can hardly beleiue, since they tooke it from *Latium*, which can hardly be so writtē. Secondly the Grecians did not vsually write ι, long, by ει: and we need go no further then to the word τειτὰν for an example. Thirdly, the reason why *S. Irenæus* expressed the diuersity of writing in τειτὰν & not in λατῖνος is plaine, because he writing in greeke could not alter the greeke Orthography without much note in the word τειτὰν, which is a greeke word: but for the word λατῖνος he made no such difficulty, because he respected only the sound and pronunciation, as we commonly doe in all Greeke wordes, which we wryte or vse as Latin. But this hindreth not, but that there is a difference betwixt λατῖνος, and *Latinus*, except M. *Downam* thinketh, that the changing, or taking away of a letter will not alter the signification, which were too absurd and grosse. And no doubt, we must rather stand to the *Latin* then to the *Greeke* Orthography of a Latin word. The like obiection maketh *Bellarmine* against *Romanus*, for it maketh not the number, except it endeth in *Tau*, and be a feminine, whereas Antichrist is to be a man by the consent of all Authors. To which M. *Downam* answereth, that *collectiue names in Hebrew, are indifferently expressed in either genders*: but he neither telleth vs, what names be collectiue, nor sheweth that *Romanus* is one of them, nor produceth any authority for that he saith: and therfore we are rather to stand to *Bellarmines* iudgment, who hath written an Hebrew grammer, then to M. *Downams*, of whō we are not sure, that he can read Hebrew: and if by a collectiue name, he exclude a proper, he is farre wyde. His second answer is, that because the name heere spoken of, is *the name of the Roman State*, it may be feminyne, since that *elsewhere that State is called the whore of Babylon, & a woman*. But we

The name of Latin containeth not the numbet 666,

The name Romansh cōteynet, not the number 666.

deny, that the name is to be attributed to any other then to Antichrist himselfe: and with vs agree in a manner all Authors, and indeed the matter is euident, and els where sufficiently proued.

See cap. 5. n. 5. &c.

The name which coteyneth the number 666. shalbe the proper & vsuall name of Antichrist

Another obiection of *Bellarmine* is, that the name signified by this number, is to be the proper and vsuall name of Antichrist, whereas *Latinus* is neither, and *Romanus* was only the proper name of one Pope who lyued but 4. monethes. To which M. *Downam* giueth no other answere but this in these wordes: *Neither ought it, seeing it is the name of the beast which signifieth a whole State*, and in setting downe *Bellarmines* obiection he omitteth the one halfe, that it must be vsuall, only making mention of the other, that it must be proper. And as you see, his answere is as slender, still running vpon that erroneous conceipt of his owne, that this is not Antichrists name, but of the *Roman* State.

VIII. Finally *Bellarmine* obiecteth that there are innumerable names, which make the same number. To which M. *Downam* after a little cauilling at some of the names, which *Bellarmine* bringeth, answereth, that though it be so, yet *none can be the name heere spoken of, vnlesse also it be the name of the beast, that is the Latin or Roman State, and vnlesse it be such a name, as he, to whome all other notes of Antichrist doe agree, causeth men to take vpon them*; which is to harpe still vpon the same string, and to sing the same song like a Cuckow; for this name belongeth to no other beast, but Antichrist: and the other part is the mayne controuersy, and therefore to assume it as a thing graunted, is *petitio principij*, a figure wherewith M. *Downam* is well acquaynted, and therefore chooseth to make it his conclusion also, as the Reader may see, if he please, to whose iudgment I leaue it to consider whether M. *Downam* hath answered *Bellarmines* argument, or rather that it is altogeather vnanswerable and inuincible, as *Bellarmine* deseruedly affirmeth.

THE

THE ELEAVENTH CHAPTER.

Of the Character of Antichriſt.

THere are alſo (ſaith *Bellarmine*) two or three opinions of Antichriſts Character. The firſt is, of the heretikes of this tyme, who teach that the Character of Antichriſt is ſome ſigne of obedyence and coniunction with the B. of *Rome*: yet they do not explicate after the ſame manner, what that ſigne is. *Hemicus Bullengerus ſer. 61. in Apoc.* will haue it to be the *vnction of Chriſme*, with which all Chriſtians that are obedient to the Pope are ſigned in their foreheads. *Theodorus Bibliander in Chron. tab. 10.* ſaith, that the Character of the Pope is the profeſſion of the Roman faith: ſo that he is not accompted a true Chriſtian, who profeſſeth not, that he cleaueth to the Roman Church. *Dauid Chytraus* beſides theſe two, addeth the Oath of Fidelity, which many are compelled to make to the Pope. Likewiſe the Preiſtly vnction, which is receaued in the crowne, and hand, and imprinteth, *as the Papiſts call it* (quoth hee) *an indeleble Character*. Finally to fall downe before Images, and conſecrated bread, and to be preſent at Maſſes of *Requiem*. I.

Neither are theſe thinges vnlike to thoſe which *Sebaſtianus Meyer*, and others alleadged by *Auguſtinus Marloratus in Apoc. 13.* do teach. But it is an eaſie matter to confute II.

theſe

» these toyes, both because they agree not with the words of
» the Text, and also because all these signes were in the Ca-
» tholike Church before that Antichrist had appeared, in
» their opinion.

III. » First therefore we haue out of the text, that the Cha-
» racter shalbe one, not many: for the Scripture alway speaketh
» in the singular number, both of the Character, and of the
» name & number of Antichrist. Wherefore there shalbe one
» Character, likewise one proper name of Antichrist, and one
» number of his name. Wherefore when our Aduersaryes
» multiply so many Characters, they shew, that they know
» not which that is, of which S. *Iohn* speaketh.

IIII. » Secondly, that Character shalbe common to all men
» in Antichrists Kingdome, as is playne by those words: *He*
» *shall make all; little & great, rich & poore, free and bound to take his Cha-*
» *racter*. But the Oath of obedyence and Priestly vnction a-
» gree to few.

V. » Thirdly, the Scripture declareth, that the Character
» shalbe such, that it may indifferently be carried in the right
» hand, or forehead, for so it saith: *He shall make all men receyue*
» *his Character in their right hands, or foreheads*. But none of those
» thinges, which our aduersaryes bring, is such: That the
» vnction of Chrisme cannot be receyued in the right hand.
» The profession of the Roman Faith, is neither in the
» hand nor forehead, but in the mouth by confession, in the
» hart by faith. The Oath of Fidelity is taken with the hand
» and mouth, but can in no wyse be carryed in the forehead.
» The Priestly vnction is neither receaued properly in the
» right hand, nor in the forehead, but vpon the head and
» fingers of both hands. Finally to be present at Masses for
» the dead, to kneele before Images, and the Eucharist, be-
» long not to the forehead or hand, but to the whole body,
» and chiefely to the knees.

VI. » Fourthly the same Scripture saith, That in the King-
» dome of Antichrist no man shalbe permitted to buy and sell,
» vnles he shew the Character, or the name, or the number
» of the name. But how many doe buy and sell in the do-
» minions of the Pope, who are not yet chrisme, nor haue
» taken the Oath of fidelity, nor are Priests? Doe not many

Iewes,

Iewes, euen in the very Citty of *Rome* where the Pope hath his Sea, negotiate publikely, buy and sell, although they haue none of those signes?

Let vs come to the other reason & proue that all these signes are elder then Antichrist. Antichrist by the opinion of our aduersaryes came not before the yeare 606. but *Tertullian* lyued about the yeare 200. and yet maketh mention of Chrisme *lib. de resurrectione carnis. The flesh* (saith he) *is washed, that the soule may be clensed: the flesh is annoynted, that the soule may be consecrated. S. Cyprian* liued about the yeare 250. and maketh mention of Chrisme *lib. 1. epist. 12. He must necessarily be annoynted* (saith he) *who is baptized, that hauing receaued Chrisme* (that is vnction) *he may be the annoynted of God, and haue in him the grace of Christ. S. Augustine* lyued about the yeare 420. and yet he saith *tract. in Ioan. 118. What is it, that all know the signe of Christ, but the Crosse of Christ? Which signe vnles it be applyed, either to the foreheads of the faithfull, or to the water with which they are regenerated, or to the oyle with which they are Chrismed, or to the Sacrifice with which they are nourished, none of these thinges is rightly performed.* VII.

Likewise to cleaue to the *Roman* Church was the signe and Character of a true Catholike man before the yeare of our Lord 606. *S. Augustine* writeth *epist. 162.* of *Cacilianus*, who liued about the yeare 300. *He needed not to care for the multytude of enemyes which conspired against him, since he saw himselfe vnited by communicatory letters to the Roman Church, in which the principality of the Apostolicall chayre alway flourished, and to the other Countries from whence the Ghospell came into Africa.* S. Ambrose, who lyued about the yeare of our Lord 390. in orat. de obitu fratris sui: *He asked the Bishop* (saith he) *if he agreed in doctrine with the Catholike Bishops, that is with the Roman Church.* VIII.

Victor Vticensis, who lyued about the yeare of our Lord 490. *lib. 1. de persecut. Vandal.* writeth, that an *Arian* Priest going about to perswade the King not to put a Catholike to death, vsed these wordes: *If thou puttest him to death the Romans will accompt him a Martyr.* In which place, by the name of *Romans*, the Catholikes of *Africa* are designed, who doubtles are not called *Romans* by the *Arians* for any other cause, but for that they followed the Faith of the *Roman* Church, IX.

» and not the misbeliefe of the *Arians*.

X. » We find the Oath of obedience made to the B. of *Rome* » in the tyme of *S. Gregory lib.* 10. *epist.* 31. and therefore be» fore the yeare 606. for *S. Gregory* lyued not so long.

XI. » Of Priestly vnction we haue the testimony of *S. Grego*» *ry Nazianzen*, who liued about the yeare 380. in *Apologet. ad* » *Patrem suum*, when he was made B. of *Sasimi*. *There came vpon* » *me againe* (quoth he) *the vnction and Spirit, and I haue new cause* » *of mourning and sadnes*. In which place, he maketh mention » of a double vnction, the one when he was made Priest, and » the other then at his consecrating Bishop. Likewise *orat.* 1. » *de pace*, speaking of *S. Basil.*, who being made Bishop refu» sed the exercize of that authority: *Although he hath the Spirit,* » *and talents, and the care of a flock committed vnto him, and is annoynted* » *with the oyle of Priesthood and perfection, yet his VVisdome delayeth to* » *take vpon him the Prelacy*.

XII. » Now for the Sacrifice for the dead, it shalbe sufficient » in this place to bring *S. Augustines* testimony, who *lib. de* » *haeres. cap.* 53. saith. That it was the peculiar fancy of *Aerius* » the Arch-Heretike, that we ought not to offer oblation » for the dead.

XIII. » Of the Adoration of Images, only *S. Hierome* who liued » about the yeare 400. shall suffice. He, *in vita Paulae*, saith » thus: *Prostrate before the Crosse, she adored, as though she had seene* » *our Lord vpon it*. Finally of the adoration of the Eucharist *S.* » *Ambrose* may deseruedly suffice, who *lib.* 3. *de Spiritu Sancto* » *cap.* 12. explicating that place, *Adore his footestoole*: *Therefore* » (saith he) *by the footestoole is meant the earth, by the earth the flesh* » *of Christ, which at this day also we adore in the mysteryes, and which* » *the Apostles adored in our Lord Iesus, as we haue said before*: which » *S. Augustine* saith, almost in the same wordes *in explicat.* » *Psal.* 98.

XIIII. » Since therefore all these thinges, which our Aduersa» ries will haue to be the Characters of Antichrist, were vsed » by the Catholike Church many yeares before Antichrist » was borne: it must needes follow, that either Antichrist » learned them of that Church (and to say this, is to con» found Antichrist with Christ) or that none of these things » belong to the Characters of Antichrist. And this is that,

which

which we prooue. Thus much shall suffice for this rash and most absurd opinion of our Aduersaries, which they haue not proued by any witnesses, or reasons.

The second opinion is of certaine Catholikes, who thinke, that Antichrists Character is the letters with which his name shalbe written. So thinke *Primasius*, *Beda*, and *Rupertus*, who seeme to be deceaued, because they read, *But he who hath the Character of the name of the beast, or the number of his name*. But *S. Iohn* saith not so, but thus, *But he who hath the Character, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name*, and the Greeke text agreeth with this, ὁ δὲ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα ἢ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου, ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. XV.

The third opinion is of *S. Hippolytus* Martyr *orat. de consummatione mundi*, & some others, that the Beastes Character shalbe not to vse the signe of the Crosse, but rather to execrate and abolish it. In which the *Caluinistes* are egregious forerunners of Antichrist. I rather thinke that Antichrist shall inuent a positiue Character also, as Christ hath the signe of the Crosse knowne to all: but it is not knowne what this Character is, vntill Antichrist commeth, as we said of the Name. XVI.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

1. THOVGH *Bellarmine* frame no particuler argument from this discourse of Antichrists Character, yet *M. Downam* will needes by *resoluing the discourse it selfe, and by conferring it with the former Chapter*, make him argue from the Character, as he did from the number of the name. About which we will not striue with him; but rather supposing that this was *Bellarmines* mynd, we will examine the solution he giueth to this argument, so framed by himselfe.

2. And first he would deny that Antichrists marke shalbe knowne at his comming, in the very same manner that he denyed before, that the number of his name should be knowne. Wherefore for this point, I remit the Reader to that which hath bene said before.

3. As also for the other, that this Character is not

yet knowne, becauſe there is ſo much controuerſy about it, for he only teacheth briefely that which he explicated more at large, about the number of his name, which we examined and confuted before.

III. Wherefore let vs ſee, what he can ſay for the Proteſtats or Heretikes of this tyme, whoſe opinion *Bellarmine* impugneth: by which we ſhall alſo diſcouer, *how much his explication helpeth them, and what abſurdity the opinion of Catholikes conteyneth.* Which two points M. *Downam* thought good to touch before he came to anſwere *Bellarmines* two proofes.

III. 4. And firſt to that out of the Scripture, M. *Downam* granteth, that the marke of Antichriſt *is but one*, meaning (as he explicateth himſelfe) *in ſubſtance, although the ſame by diuers meanes, may be diuerſly expreſſed and teſtified, that is, ſubiection to the Pope as their head, and the acknowledgment of the Sea of Rome, and of the Popes Supremacy* &c. But what he meaneth by *one in ſubſtance*, is not eaſy to conceaue, except it be this, that all the outward ſignes, Characters, and markes agree in this, that they ſignify the ſame ſubiection to the Pope &c. ſo that the markes ſhalbe diſtinct, and diuers in themſelues, and in their manner of ſignification, though the thing by them ſignified be one. But this is not ſufficient to affirme, that the Character of Antichriſt is but one, for in this ſort the name, and the number of the name, and the Charcter are all one in ſubſtance, ſince they ſignify the ſame thing; and all ſignes which ſignify the ſame thing may be ſaid to be one in ſubſtance, as wryting, ſpeach, geſture, and the like: and all the figures in the old Teſtament, which ſignified Chriſt are but one figure in ſubſtance, and all the Sacraments of the Church which ſignify grace, ſhalbe but one Sacrament, which is too great an abſurdity for M. *Downam* to defend, & conſequently he muſt needes graunt, that his fellow Ghoſpellers aſſigne more Characters then one, contrary to the Scripture, and therefore they are ſo farre from truly interpreting the Scripture, that they wholy peruert it.

The mark or Character of Antichriſt but one.

IIII. To *Bellarmines* ſecond inſtance, out of the Scripture, M. *Downam* giueth no direct anſwere at all, but would faine put it off, by telling vs, that the Pope hath declared, *that it is neceſſary to ſaluation*, to be ſubiect to the Pope. But this is only:

ly to shew, that the body must be vnited with the head, in which all Religions whatsoeuer, yea all Societies must needes agree. But *Bellarmines* instance impugneth two of the markes, which some Protestants affirme to be the Characters of Antichrist, by this euident proofe, that the Character of Antichrist shalbe common to all men in Antichrists Kingdome as the Scripture plainely affirmeth: but the oath of Obedience, and the Priestly vnction agree to few, therefore these cānot be the Character whereof the Scripture speaketh. To this *M. Downam* answereth not a word, neither indeed could he, for euery part and parcel is most euident and playne, and therefore he was inforced to run to his old shift, and to bring vs his wonted figure of *petitio principy*, by which he desireth vs to graunt him his conclusion, that the Pope is Antichrist, without any further proofe. But he must pardon vs, because it importeth vs much to hould with Christ, which we cannot see how we can possibly doe, if we oppose our selues against his substitute and Vicegerent, as though he were Antichrist, as *M. Downam* would haue vs.

The mark of Antichrist shalbe common to all in his Kingdome.

To the third instance, *M. Downam* answereth more formally, denying that the Scripture speaketh *of the carrying of this marke, and the carrying of it indifferently either in the forehead or in the hand*. But by *M. Downams* leaue, the Scripture mentioneth both the *forehead* and the *right hand*, & that with disiunction, that all must haue the marke in the one or in the other: by which it is plaine, that either of them will serue: so that it is indifferent to Antichrist in which of them his marke be carryed, so that it be carried in the one of them: for that it must be carryed, is euident by the Scripture euen according to *M. Downams* translation, which is this: *That he may giue them a marke on their right hand, or els on their foreheads*. For surely if he giue them a marke on either place, they must carry it perforce. Now as for his Mysticall interpretation, that they shall *receaue this marke on their forehead by profession, or in the right hand by practize and operation*: first it is hard to vnderstand, how profession is made with the forehead, except there be some marke vpon the forehead, and it will be no very easy matter for Antichrists Ministers to examine euery man that

V.

Antichrists Character may be caried either in the right hand or forehead.

This Character is not profession or practise.

wouldbuy or sell, of their practise and operation; and finally those vnctions, which are assigned can hardly be drawne to either of these two heads, if profession be taken properly for declaration, by speach, and practise for our owne actions and operations, since they doe rather import a suffering and passiue receauing, then any actiue operation, in which notwithstanding they draw neerer to this marke which shalbe giuen by Antichrist, and receaued by all others, and therefore neither profession, not practise agreeth well to this marke. Finally *M. Downam* seemeth to contradict himselfe: for on the one side he will haue profession and practise to answere to the forehead and hand, and consequently to be the marke, and yet a little after he saith, that the subiection it selfe is the marke, which is not only contrary to the former, but also foolish: since that this subiection is the thing signified by the marke, and not the marke it selfe. For what wise man would euer say, that subiectiō is a signe or marke, but rather that other things are signes and markes of it, as appeareth plainly to any, that will consider the subiection of seruantes to their Maisters, subiects to their Prince, and of Christians to Christ and God &c.

M. Downam contradicteth himselfe.

VI. To the fourth instance *M. Downams* answere is, that Antichrist shall prohibite all Christians, that haue not his marke to buy or sell &c. but he will *permit the Iewes* &c. But we find no such exceptiō in the Scripture, which generally affirmeth, that he shall not permit any, *little or great, rich or poore, free or bound*, vnder which diuisions, no doubt, not only the whole nation of the Iewes, but euen euery particuler Iew is comprehended. And besides, we find no such rigour in the Pope towards *M. Downams* Christians: for though that Bull of *Martinus Quintus* had ben generall for all tymes and places, as it was not, yet doth it not exact that euery man should professe by word or worke his subiection to the Pope, before he be admitted to buy or sell any thing at all, especially such things as are necessary for daily sustenance, but only excludeth all *Hussites* &c. from all human conuersation (when vtility or necessity, or some other lawfull circumstance doth not otherwise require) which are openly, manifestly, and notoriously such: which is farre

The Bull of Martinus Quintus against the Hussites.

lesse

leſſe rigour, then Antichriſt ſhall vſe, and yet much more then we ſee vſed in many Countries now, euen by *Martinus Quintus* his authority, where Catholikes and Heretikes are permitted to liue peaceably togeather. Yea euen in *Italy* & *Spayne*, & *Rome* it ſelfe, where they are moſt carefull to auoyd this contagion, there is no ſuch rigour vſed as *M. Downam* ſpeaketh of; the reaſon of which we ſhall afterward declare more at large. But though all this be true, yet we muſt not omit to obſerue, that *Bellarmine* in this inſtance only impugneth three of the markes, which *M. Downams* brethren aſſigned, viz. *Chriſme*, the Oath of *Fidelity*, and *Preiſthood*. All which three, it is euident, that not only all Iewes, but likewiſe very many Chriſtians, yea Catholikes alſo haue not, and yet are permitted to buy and ſell: neither are they once queſtioned withall about any of them. All which *M. Downam* could not chooſe but ſee, though becauſe he could find no ſolution for *Bellarmines* inſtance thus lymited, he thought beſt to runne to generalityes, where he might roue at randome, and make his Reader believe, that he had ſomething to ſay, though he ſaw himſelfe that he could ſay nothing directly to the purpoſe. *See part. 2. cap. 8. §. 7.*

VII. *M. Downam* hauing thus diſpatched the firſt argument commeth to the ſecond; where firſt he affirmeth, that *though thoſe things had bene vſed in the Catholike Church before the reuelation of Antichriſt, yet that hindereth not, but that now they may appertayne to the marke of the beaſt*, becauſe he doubteth not to affirme *that there were many corruptions crept into the Church before the reuealing of Antichriſt, which he was to retayne with increaſe*. So that as you ſee, the marke of Antichriſt was in the world before himſelfe, yea in the Catholike Church, which conſequently muſt needes belong to Antichriſt, and be a great freind of his, as indeed ſhe is to the Pope, and euer was, and wilbe as to her chiefe Paſtour vpon earth. But how ſhe ſhould beare and vniuerſally imbrace any marke or corruption of Antichriſt, ſeemeth as vnpoſſible, as that Chriſt and Antichriſt ſhall haue both one marke, or one Church, and therefore *M. Downam* muſt either perſwade vs, that euen from the Apoſtles tymes the Church of Chriſt bare Antichriſts marke, and conſequently that he was then come, or els he muſt:

The Church of God cannot haue the marke of Antichriſt.

must graunt, that his brethren haue not rightely assigned the markes of Antichrist, but rather haue vttered an horrible blasphemy, charging Christs Church, and consequently Christ himselfe (who teacheth his Church) with the markes and doctrine of Antichrist. But *M. Downam* giueth vs two differences, betwixt these markes before Antichrists comming and after. First *vntill the yeare 607. there was not* (saith he) *in the Catholike Church an vniuersall subiection to the Pope as the head*, and consequently till then, *these things could not be vsed as signes thereof, as since they haue*. But *M. Downam* may when it pleaseth him, take the paines to peruse what *Bellarmine* bringeth in the 19. & last Chapter of his second booke concerning this point, & I doubt not, but he will acknowledge an vniuersall subiection to the Pope euen from the Apostles; or if he be obstinate, and will not yield to an euident truth, yet I am sure, he will neuer be able to answere *Bellarmines* proofes; & if his pryde be such that he presumeth that he can; let him begin, when he will, and see what he shall gaine by it. The second difference which *M. Downam* alleadgeth is, that before the yeare 607. these thinges *were not imposed and inioyned vpon all by the lawes of the Pope as since they are; so that the cause of vsing them now is not the example of the ancient Church, but the authority of the Popes law*. But this is a very poore difference, and argueth a wonderfull corruption in the ancient Church, since that she was so forward to take Antichrists markes, that she needed no commaund: and besides, if *M. Downam* will take the paines to peruse the anciēt Councells, and Decrees of Popes, which *Bellarmine* bringeth in these particuler controuersies, he shall find, that there was the same necessity for all men to performe these things then, that there is now, many of them being commaunded by Gods law, and others not exacted of all, and some not of any, as the Reader may easily distinguish by considering the particulers.

M. Downams blasphemy.

The Church was alway subiect to the Pope.

Downam maketh the anciēt Church to be very corrupt.

VII. Chrisme vsed in the Church before the yeare 607.

6. Wherefore now let vs consider how *M. Downam* answereth *Bellarmines* particuler obiectiōs. And first cōcerning *Chrisme* he answereth, that *those three Fathers speake of the annoynting with oyle vsed in the Sacrament of Baptisme*; and addeth, *that this also without warrant of the Scripture is retayned among the Papists*.

Where

Where you ſee he maketh theſe three Fathers Papiſts in that point at the leaſt: and though it be true, that they acknowledge that Cerimony of Baptiſme; yet in theſe places, they ſpeake moſt plainely of Chriſme, and the Sacrament of Confirmation. For *Tertullian*, and *S. Cyprian* compare it with baptiſme, attributing to it the effects of grace, aſwell as to Baptiſme: and *S. Auguſtine* placeth it betwixt baptiſme and the Euchariſt, and calleth it *Chriſming*, which is the proper name of this Sacrament. Wherefore *M. Downam* muſt of force confeſſe, that theſe Fathers were Papiſts in this point alſo, and that this marke was long before the yeare 607. Now whether this vnction were vſed *in the primitiue Church*, or no, is a new queſtion belonging to another place, and it is inough for vs now, that it was long before Antichriſt came, according to the Proteſtants accompt: and that they do not *much vſe euen the impoſition of hands*, which they acknowledg was vſed in the primityue Church: of which *M. Downam* can giue no better reaſon, then for that *it was abuſed* by vs. By which in their opinion they might alſo leaue off Baptiſme, Euchariſt, and all other rites and exerciſes of Chriſtian Religion, as indeed they haue done in great part; only they loue to heare themſelues talke in a Pulpit, though they ſay neuer a true, nor wiſe word. I omit his other impertinent obiections out of the Canon law, where firſt that holy Pope and Martyr *Melchiades* ſaith, that a man *ſhall neuer be a Chriſtian* (meaning a ſtrong and valiant, or perfect Chriſtian) except he firſt receaue this Sacrament: for ſo he vſeth the name (*Chriſtianus*) as the *Latins* vſe (*Vir*) and the *Aurelian* Councell ſaith, that this Sacrament is more to *be reuerenced, then Baptiſme*, if we reſpect the perſon of him who miniſtreth it, becauſe he muſt of neceſſity be a Biſhop, and beſides this Sacrament ſuppoſeth, and in ſome ſort includeth baptiſme, and in that reſpect is ſaid to be more venerable, then baptiſme by it ſelfe. And this is all that *M. Downam* can ſay for himſelfe, or againſt vs; for that which he addeth cõcerning *the ordayning* of the Sacrament, as though it were ordayned by the Church, and not by Chriſt, is a fond Chymera of his owne. For we affirme that it was inſtituted by Chriſt, as all other Sacraments were: and beſides it

How chriſme maketh vs Chriſtians. *de Conſecrat. diſt. 5. c. Vt ieiun. Ibid. c. De his verò.*

How Chriſme is more to be reuerenced then Baptiſme,

it is now from the purpose, since our whole question is, whether this Sacrament were vsed before the yeare 607. which *Bellarmine* hath euidently conuinced that it was.

VIII. IX. To the second obiection *M. Downam* answereth with a distinction; that to *cleaue to the Roman Church in ancient tyme, was the note of a good Christian, because then that Church was Apostolicall; but now it is the marke of an Antichristian, because now that Church is Apostaticall*. Where you find him still in the same fault of *petitio principij*. And besides you see, he graunteth asmuch as *Bellarmine* would haue him, that in old tyme the cleauing to the Roman Church was so far from beeing the marke of Antichrist, that it was the (chiefest) note to know a good Catholike Christian, from a false and wicked heretike: and consequently it is to be accompted so still. For the heretikes in those tymes could say as *M. Downam* doth, that the Roman Church was Apostaticall, but they were not able to proue it any more, then *M. Downam* is: and all good Catholikes were then, and are now certayne, that it can neuer be so, since Christ hath promised the contrary to *S. Peter* and his successors. And besides it is very strange, that Christ and Antichrist should both haue one marke. And that the arguments, which the old Fathers vsed against heretikes, should come to be vsed by Antichrist against Catholikes. But to these absurdities must they needes fall, who call light darkenes, and darkenes light, as *M. Downam* and all heretikes doe. *M. Downam* goeth forward with his distinctions and differences, affirming, that in ancient tymes, *as other Churches did cleaue to the Church of Rome, so did the Church of Rome cleaue to them. Now it acknowledgeth no Church besides it selfe*. All which is false; for now also other Churches cleaue to the Church of Rome, as to their head; and the Church of *Rome* cleaueth to them as to her members; and it acknowledgeth many other particuler Churches besides it selfe still, though all subiect and subordinate to it as they were euer. And that which he addeth is a meere cauill; for the Church of *Rome*, if we vnderstand that particuler dioceese, is still accompted but a part of the Catholike Church: and in this sense, a man may still be a good Christian, although he be not of the Church of *Rome*. And in ancient tymes, the Church

Christ & Antichrist cannot haue both one marke

How the Church of Rome is vnited & standeth with other Churches.

Church of *Rome* alone (that is the Church, of which the Bishop of *Rome* is the chiefe Pastor) was accompted the Catholike Church. And consequently that he that was not a member of that Church was not taken for a Catholike or true Christian, as appeareth sufficiently by the places, which *Bellarmine* citeth, to which I will only adde one more out of *S. Hierome* in his Epistle to Pope *Damasus*. *I am vnited in Communion* (saith he) *to thy Blessednes, that is, to the Chayre of Peter. I know that the Church was built vpon that rock; whosoeuer eateth the Lambe out of this house, is prophane: if any man be not in the Arke of Noe, he will perish in the deluge. I know not* Vitalis, *I refuse* Meletius, *I esteeme not* Paulinus, *whosoeuer gathereth not what thee scattereth, that is, whosoeuer belongeth not to Christ, belongeth to Antichrist.* Now let *M. Downam* compare the writing of any Catholike at this tyme, and see if they attribute more to the Pope or Church of *Rome* at this tyme, then *S. Hierome* did at that; and withall consider, if in *S. Hieromes* iudgement, it be not a playne marke of an Antichristian to be against the Roman Church, and of a good Christian to be vnited to it.

Those which belong not to the Church of Rome belong not to Christ but to Antichrist.

8. To the third obiection *M. Downam* answereth, that the Oath which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth, *is not an Oath of obedience, and allegiance to the Pope, but of faith and Religion towards God, conformable to the faith, and Religion then professed by the Bishop and Church of Rome.* But by *M. Downams* leaue, the wordes of the Bishop are these: *Sub mei ordinis casu spondeo, atq; promitto tibi, & per te Sancto Petro Apostolorum principi, atq; eius Vicario Beatissimo Gregorio, vel successoribus ipsius, me numquã &c. ad schismata reuersurũ, sed semper me in vnitate Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & communione Romani Pontificis per omnia permansurum.* Vnder perill of loosing my place, I profer & promise to thee, and by thee to *S. Peter* Prince of the Apostles, and to most blessed *Gregory* his Vicar, or to the successors of him, that I will neuer returne to schisme, but will alwayes in all pointes remayne in the vnity of the holy Catholike Church, and in the communion of the B. of *Rome*. By which we see, that the promise to remayne in the communion of the Pope, was as absolute, as that other to remayne in the vnity of the Catholike Church: which I suppose *M. Downam* will admit to be perpetuall without limitation of any tyme. And this

X.

The oath of obedience made to the B. of Rome before the yeare 606.

promise he presently cõfirmeth with an Oath by Almighty God, by the 4. Ghospells which he held in his hands, and by the health of Nations, and of the rulers of his Commonwealth. Now it is a friuolous cauill to say, that this Oath was taken vpon the occasion of his lapse; for this *Bellarmine* denieth not, but only affirmeth that it was taken before the comming of Antichrist, according to the Protestãts accompt. Neither is it to the purpose, that now such Oathes are more generall, and common; for this *Bellarmine* denieth not: and who seeth not that the exaction of Oaths may proceed vpon diuers occasions? And if the Oath be lawfull, the often exacting of it is not culpable, but rather commendable: arguing greater vigilancy in them, which gouerne. And the like may be said of some other clauses more expresly set downe in some other formes of oathes, according to the necessity of tymes, and the qualities of them, who are to sweare. *M. Downam* should shew vs that there is any oath exacted of any now, that is not fit to be performed by them, which thinke it necessary to liue in the communion of the Pope, as this Bishop did, as appeareth by his Oath; wherein he promiseth as much in generall, as any other can expresse in particuler: for he protesteth, that he will neuer be drawne from this cõmunion by any perswasions or any other meanes, and consequently that he will alway remaine in the obedience of the Pope; for he renounceth not any heresy, as *M. Downam* supposeth, but only schisme, which he performed by returning *ad vnitatem Sedis Apostolicæ*, to the vnity of the Apostolike Sea, which I hartily wish, that *M. Downam* and his fellow Protestants may also doe; for otherwise it would not be sufficient to renounce their heresies, though this were a good step to that.

If the Oath be lawfull, the often exacting of it is not culpable.

XI. Priestly vnction vsed before the yeare 606. *De sacra vnctione. Cùm venisset.*

To the fourth, after a fit of rayling, *M. Downam* answereth at length, that *both the places of S. Gregory Nazianzen are to be vnderstood figuratiuely of consecration to the Ministry:* & this he endeauoureth to proue *by the testimony of Innoc. 3. by which it appeareth that this cerimony of annoynting was not vsed in the Greek Church, whereof Nazianzen was; but reiected as Iewish, vntill he imposed the same vpon them about the yeare 1209.* But *M. Downam* goeth beyond

beyond *Innocentius*, for he only affirmeth that they, to whom he wrote, that is at the moſt, the Grecians of his tyme, were not wont to vſe this cerimony of annoynting: but that the Greeke Church had not vſed it before, *Innocentius* affirmeth not, and much leſſe, that they had reiected it as Iewiſh. Wherefore theſe are *M. Downams* additions, which we may bouldly reiect, ſince he hath no proofe for them, and conſequently his figuratiue interpretation falleth to the ground, and we are to take the words of *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, as they ſound; eſpecially ſince others as ancient as he both of the Greeke and Latin Church make expreſſe mention of this Cerimony, as *M. Downam* may ſee in *Bellarmine lib. 1. de Sacramento Ordinis cap. 12.* where he alſo handleth this obiection out of *Innocentius* 3. and vrgeth it further then *M. Downam* doth: whome I muſt intreat not to be angry though I paſſe ouer his rayling in ſilence, ſince he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe which is not already anſwered; for now all our queſtion is, how ancient this Cerimony is, and for the lawfulneſſe therof I remit him to the place of *Bellarmine* already alleaged, where he ſolueth that obiection taken from the Iewes, and whatſoeuer els *M. Downam* can inuent.

Bellarmin vrgeth Downams obiection further then he doth himſelfe.

10. To the fifth obiection *M. Downams* anſwere is, that *S. Auguſtine* is to be vnderſtood of *Sacrifice of prayer*, and not of any *propitiatory Sacrifice*; but by *M. Downams* leaue he cannot carry it ſo; for we will appeale to *S. Chryſoſtome*, *S. Cyril*, and *S. Auguſtine* himſelfe. For firſt *S. Chryſoſtome lib. 6. de Sacerdotio* writeth thus. *The Prieſt is an Embaſſador for the whole world, and an interceſſour with God, that he wilbe propitious to the ſinnes of all men, not only of the liuing, but alſo of the dead. Cyrillus Hieroſ. catechef. 5. myſtag. VVe beliene* (ſaith he) *that it is the greateſt help of theſe ſoules for which the obſecration of that holy and dreadfull Sacrifice which is laid vpon the Altar is offred.* And *S. Auguſtine* himſelfe *quaſt. 57. in Leuit.* affirmeth, that in this Sacrifice, *vera fit remiſſio peccatorum, ſinnes are truly forgiuen:* and *tract. 84. in Ioan.* anſwering directely *M. Downams* diſtinction, he writeth thus: *Therefore at the Table it ſelfe we do not ſo make Commemoration of the Martyrs, as of others, who reſt in peace ſo that we alſo pray for them: but rather that they may pray for vs.* By all which, it is plaine, that in the tyme of theſe Saintes, Maſſes were offered for the

XII. Sacrifice for the dead vſed before the yeare 606.

dead, in the very same manner, that they are offered now, and consequently this is no marke of Antichrist, except *M. Downam* wilbe so bould, as to marke these holy Fathers with it, by which amongst wise men, he shall only get to himselfe the opinion of an impudent heretike, one of the forerunners of the true Antichrist indeed.

XIII. Adoratiõ of Images vsed before the yeare 606.

11. To the sixt (for we will omit his citation of *Bishop Iewell*, as sufficiently answered by D. *Harding*) *M. Downam* answereth first, that the adoration, which holy *S. Paula* vsed, was *not a common practise, but peculiar to her*. But we must intreate him to let her haue *S. Hieromes* company at least, who commendeth this her deuotion. Secondly he saith, that it *was not vsuall vnto her, but only at that tyme, and that place*. But how will he proue this? Was it not asmuch to kisse the stone of the Sepulcher, and to licke the place where Christs body lay, as to kneele downe before the Crosse? Thirdly he saith, that *she did not worship the Crosse as Papists doe; but falling before that Crosse, worshiped Christ*. Well then, will *M. Downam* be content to do asmuch? We will only desire thus much of him, that he will apply that outward reuerence to the Crosse, because it representeth Christ, whome he inwardely submitteth himselfe vnto, and adoreth. And so much it is plaine, that *S. Paula* did in this and her other actions of kissing and licking the Sepulcher: and in this sort only doe we attribute the *worship of Latria* to the Crosse, so that the outward reuerence be exhibited to the Crosse, as a thing belonging to Christ, to whome the inward submission is wholy and entirely giuen.

How Latria is giuen to the Crosse by Catholikes.

XIIII. Adoratiõ of the Eucharist vsed before the yeare 606.

To the authority of *S. Amborse* for the adoration of the *Blessed Sacrament*, he answereth, that Christ may *be adored in his Sacraments*; but the *Sacrament is not to be adored*. To which I answere, that we adore the flesh of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Protestants will not allow of, but *S. Ambrose* doth, & the Sacrament it selfe, that is, euen the forme of bread and wyne may be adored in that manner, that we haue explicated of the Crosse, that is, as a thing belonging to Christ; but alway the inward submission and adoration is to be referred to the person of Christ, which must needes be in the Sacrament, since his body and humanity is there,

as

as *S. Ambroſe* affirmeth. Now that which *M. Downam* addeth out of *S. Ambroſe* in the ſame place, is nothing to the purpoſe. For we know very well, that our *B. Lady* is not to be adored with that adoration, which is due to the Holy Ghoſt and Chriſt, which is all that *S. Ambroſe* there affirmeth, as appeareth euidently euen by thoſe words which *M. Downam* alleadgeth. Finally his euaſion to the authority of *S. Auguſtine* is very friuolous, for he neuer goeth about to anſwere the words, but ſuppoſeth that *S. Auguſtine* would not affirme the reall preſence which yet his wordes muſt needes import, ſince he ſaith that *we eate Chriſts flesh*, and *that no man eateth, but he firſt adoreth*: which is the very ſame, that *M. Downam* will needes haue to be the marke of Antichriſt: ſo that if we will belieue him, all the Chriſtians in *S. Auguſtines* tyme had the marke of Antichriſt: for which his pleading no doubt if *M. Downam* lyue to ſee Antichriſts raigne, he ſhall haue a good fee; and howſoeuer, he cannot goe vnrewarded, ſince the Dragon to whom Antichriſt belongeth taketh a record of all ſuch worthy enterpryzes, that tend ſo highly to the aduancement of his Kingdome. God graunt that *M. Downam* may take a better courſe in time.

12. Thus we might conclude this Chapter, but that we will not omit to examine how *M. Downam* impugneth the Catholikes opinion in generall, for that they ſeeme to agree in this, that the Character is a viſible marke of Antichriſts name which notwithſtanding he might haue ſeene denied by *Bellarmine*, prouing out of the Scripture that the marke of Antichriſt and his name, or the number of his name are not all one. But indeed that which *M. Downam* chiefely impugneth is, that it ſhalbe viſible, and yet in this alſo he is deceyued. For *S. Hippolytus* Martyr thought, that it ſhould be a priuatiue ſigne, that is, the not vſing the ſigne of the Croſſe, which is the marke of Chriſt: for which *M. Downam* was ſo angrie with him, and with *Bellarmine* both that he calleth him a counterfaite Author, and chargeth the other with falſifying his teſtimony. But for *S. Hippolytus*, *Euſebius l. 6. cap. 14.* and *S. Hierome in Scriptoribus* will anſwere, who recount many of his learned workes, and *S. Hierome* nameth this of Antichriſt, & *S. Ambroſe* the Martyr thought him.

num. 3.

XV.

XVI.

num. 2.

him a fit man to propose to learned *Origen* to imitate? Now how *Bellarmine* hath falsified his testimony, *M. Downam* doth not tell vs, nor we can imagine, except it be, for that illation of his, that in *S. Hippolytus* his iudgment, Protestants are notable forerunners of Antichrist, which notwithstanding is most manifest, since they neither vse themselues, nor will suffer others by their good will, to vse the signe of the Crosse vpon their foreheads, or to carry the picture of it in their handes, or to haue it before their eyes, as the Christians vsed in *S. Hippolytus* daies (who liued not 200. yeares after Christs Passion) and Catholikes vse to this day.

Antichrists marke shalbe visible.

But let vs see, how *M. Downam* impugneth those Catholike Authors, that thinke it shalbe a visible marke: his first argument is, because *it is a grosse thing to imagine, that Princes and Magistrates, and men of all sortes would euer suffer themselues to be branded, as it were with Antichrists visible marke*. To which I answere, that it were grosse indeed to imagine so, if these Princes &c. were not forced vnto it by danger of incurring otherwise some greater inconuenience, because it is not probable, that all shalbe so far gone that they will glory in Antichrists marke, though no doubt many will, and others will seem to do so, though in their harts they mislike it. Neither are we to thinke, that Antichrist shall want deuises how to do this without paine or deformity. But I would faine know, where *M. Downam* found this imagination of branding, for I cannot see why all Catholikes may not be vnderstood to speake only of such a visible marke, as the signe of the Crosse, which is visible inough, and yet we see no man branded with it. His second Argument is, that if this were Antichrists practize, *euery man would be able to discerne him*. But what meaneth *M. Downam* by discerning. No doubt men shall discerne him to be an enemy of Christ, and the question in those daies wilbe, which of them is the true Christ, for he will affirme himselfe not only to be the true Christ, but also will extoll himselfe aboue all, that is called God. Thirdly *M. Downam* obiecteth the *ordinary glosse*, *Antoninus*, and *Lira*, and referreth himselfe to some places of Scripture: by all which he only ouerthroweth his owne assertion, that all Catholikes agree that Antichrists marke shalbe

Downam contradicteth him selfe.

ſhalbe ſuch a viſible ſigne, as he impugneth, ſince now he himſelfe hath found ſome who thinke otherwiſe: and beſides, this is a new confirmation, that this Character is yet vnknowne ſince that Authors are ſo deuided in their opinions concerning it. Finally, ſo farre, as theſe Authors agree with the heretikes or differ from *Bellarmine*, they are ſufficiently confuted by him, with the ſame arguments with which he impugned the heretikes themſelues. And as for the Scriptures we ſhall more commodiouſly diſcuſſe them in another place, where *M. Downam* vrgeth them ſomewhat more in particuler, for now he alleadgeth them only in generall, and ſo we anſwere in generall, that though other places cannot without abſurdity be vnderſtood of viſible marks, yet that proueth not, but that this place is ſo to be vnderſtood, ſince no doubt, ſome markes may be viſible, and all circumſtances argue a viſible marke in this place, though we cannot in particuler certainely tell, what this marke ſhalbe, which is a plaine token, that Antichriſt is not yet come as *M. Downam* maketh *Bellarmine* to reaſon in this place, and he himſelfe demonſtrateth a little before, applying it to Antichriſts name, as we haue ſeene.

See part. 2. cap. 8. §. 4.

THE TVVELVTH CHAPTER.

Of Antichriſts Generation.

I. AS for the fifth (ſaith *Bellarmine*) of the Generation of Antichriſt there are ſome thinges euidently erroneous affirmed by ſome; ſome thinges probable, and ſome manifeſt and certayne. Firſt then, there were in tymes paſt many errours of Antichriſt. The firſt, that Antichriſt ſhalbe borne of a Virgin by the worke of the Diuell, as Chriſt was borne of a Virgin by the worke of the holy Ghoſt.

II. This errour is reported by the Author of the Treatiſe of Antichriſt which goeth vnder *S. Auguſtines* name in the end of his 9. Tome, which ſeemeth probable to be made by *Rabanus*: certainely it is not *S. Auguſtines*. This is a manifeſt errour for it is only the worke of God (who can ſupply all efficient cauſes) to produce a man without the ſeed of man, becauſe he only is of infinite power and contayneth virtually all the perfection of creatures. The Diuell who is a creature can indeed doe meruaylous workes by ſpeedy application of actiue thinges to paſſiue, but he cannot ſupply the actiuity of cauſes. Wherfore *S. Auguſtine ep. 3. ad Voluſian.* ſaith, that to be borne of a Virgin was ſuch a miracle in Chriſt

Christ, that there could not be a greater expected from God.

Yet it were no errour to say, that Antichrist shall be borne of the Diuell and a woman, in that sort that some are said to be borne of the Diuells, which we call *Incubi*: for though the Diuell cannot by himselfe without the seed of man produce a man, yet he can in a body assumed in the forme of a woman, receaue the seed of man, and after in the forme of a man cast that seed into a womans wombe & so beget a child. This *S. Augustine* testifieth *lib.* 15. *de ciuitate Dei cap.* 23. and addeth, that this hath ben proued by so great experience, that it may seeme madnes to go about to deny it still. III.

The second errour was of the blessed Martyr *Hippolytus* who in *orat. de consummatione mundi* teacheth, that Antichrist shalbe the Diuell himselfe, who shall assume false flesh of a false Virgin: for as the word of God, who is truth it selfe, tooke true flesh of a true Virgin; so *S. Hippolytus* thought it probable, that the Diuell who is the Father of lyes would faigne himselfe to haue taken mans flesh of a Virgin. This opinion is refuted, both becausc 2. *Thessal.* 2. Antichrist is called a man, as also becausc the rest of the Fathers with common consent do write, that Antichrist shalbe truly a man. IIII.

The third errour is, that Antichrist shalbe a true man indeed, but withall a Diuell by the incarnatiō of the Diuell, as Christ by his incarnation is God and man. This error is reported and confuted by *S. Hierome in cap.* 7. *Dan. Beda in c.* 13. *Apoc.* and *S. Damascen l.* 4. *c.* 28. V.

Origen thought this opinion possible: for he affirmed, that some Angells were truly incarnate, whom *S. Hierome* confuteth *in præfat. in Malach. & in cap.* 1. *Aggæi*. And doubtlesse it is erroneous, for no created, and consequently finite person can sustayne two perfect natures as the Word of God who is infinite can. Neither is there any controuersy of this now among Deuines: for though some say that it doth altogeather imply a contradiction, others teach it doth not: yet all agree in this, that it cannot be done by the force of only a creature, as the Diuell is. *Tom.* 2. *in Ioan.* VI.

» The fourth errour is, that *Nero* ſhall riſe againe, and that
VII. » he ſhalbe Antichriſt, or els that he liueth ſtill, and is ſecret-
» ly preſerued in his youthly vigour, and ſhall appeare in
» his tyme. *Sulpitius lib. 2. ſacræ hiſt.* inſinuateth this errour;
» yet *lib. 2. dial. de virt. S. Martini*, he writeth plainely, that
» *Nero* ſhall not be Antichriſt himſelfe, but that he ſhall come
» with Antichriſt, and at length be ſlayne by Antichriſt. But
» becauſe all theſe thinges are ſaid without any reaſon, *S. Aug.*
» *lib. 20. de ciu. Dei. cap. 19.* deſeruedly calleth this opinion a
» meruaylous preſumption.

VIII. » Beſides theſe errours, there are two probable opinions
» of the holy Fathers, of the generation of Antichriſt. The
» firſt is, that Antichriſt ſhalbe borne of an Harlot, and not
» of any lawfull matrimony. So teach *S. Damaſcen lib. 4. c. 28.*
» and ſome others. But ſince it cannot be proued by Scri-
» pture, it is probable, but not certayne.

IX. » The ſecond opinion is, that Antichriſt ſhalbe borne of
» the Tribe of *Dan*: ſo affirme *S. Irenæus l. 5. S. Hippolytus Martyr*
» *orat. de mundi conſummat. S. Ambroſe l. de benedict. Patriarch. c. 7.*
» *S. Aug. quæſt. 22. in Ioſue. S. Proſper de promiſſion. & prædict. Dei*
» *part. 4. Theodoret. quæſt. 109. in Gen. S. Greg. l. 31. moral. c. 18.*
» *Beda, Rupertus, Arethas, Richardus & Anſel. in Apoc. c. 7.* They
» proue it out of *Geneſis* 49. *Fiat Dan coluber in via, ceraſtes in*
» *ſemita &c.* and *ex Hier. 8. Ex Dan audiuimus fremitum equorum*
» *eius &c.* Finally becauſe *Apoc. 7.* where 12000. are ſigned
» by the Angel out of euery Tribe of the children of Iſrael,
» the Tribe of *Dan* is omitted, which ſeemeth to be done in
» hatred to Antichriſt.

X. » This opinion is very probable, for the authority of ſo
» many Fathers, and yet not altogeather certayne, both be-
» cauſe many of theſe Fathers do not ſay, that they know it,
» but inſinuate it to be probable; as alſo for that none of thoſe
» Scriptures do conuynce. For firſt *Gen. 49. Iacob* ſeemeth to
» ſpeake litterally of *Sampſon* when he ſaith: *Let Dan be made*
» *a Snake in the way, an horned Serpent in the path: and let him byte the*
» *heeles of the horſe, that the ryder may fall backeward.* For *Sampſon*
» was of the Tribe of *Dan*, and he was truly like a ſnake in the
» way to the *Philiſtians*, for he met them in euery place and
» vexed them. So *S. Hierome* expoundeth it *in quæſt. Hebr.* and

ſurely

surely Iacob seemeth to wish well to his Sonne, when he » saith these wordes, and therefore not to foretell euill, but » good. »

And if it be allegorically applyed to Antichrist, it can » XI. be but a probable argument, such as is drawne out of mysti- » call senses. And without doubt *Hieremie cap.* 8. speaketh not » of Antichrist, nor of the Tribe of *Dan*, but of *Nabuchodonosor* » who was to come to ouerthrow *Hierusalem* through the » Country which was called *Dan*, as *S. Hierome* rightely ex- » poundeth it vpon that place. Now why *Dan* is omitted » *Apoc.* 7. is vnknowne, especially since *Ephraim* also is omitted, » whose Tribe is one of the greatest. »

Besides these two probable assertions, there are other » XII. two most certaine: the one, that Antichrist shall chiefly » come for the Iewes, and shalbe receaued by them as the *Mes-* » *sias*. The other that he shalbe borne of the Nation of the » Iewes, and be circumcised and obserue the Sabboth at least » for a tyme. This is proued, first out of the Ghospell *Ioan.* 5. » where our Lord saith to the Iewes: *I came in the name of my* » *Father, and you haue not receaued me: if another come in his owne name,* » *him you will receaue*. Which place that it ought to be vnder- » stood of Antichrist we haue proued before *cap.* 2. Likewise » out of the Apostle 2. *Thessal.* 2. *Because they haue not receaued the* » *charity of Truth, that they may be saued: therefore God shall send them* » *the operation of Errour, that they may believe a lye &c.* *Caluin* and » other Heretikes in their Commentaries vpon these words » expound this place of vs, who because we haue not receaued » their Ghospell, are suffered to be seduced by the Antichrist » of *Rome*. But first they bring forth no witnesses, but we » haue all the Interpreters of our side who expound it of the » Iewes. See *S. Ambrose*, *S. Chrysostome*, *Theodoretus*, *Theophila-* » *ctus*, *Oecumenius*. »

Besides these, *S. Hierome quæst.* 11. *ad Algasiam*, saith thus: » XIII. *Antichrist shall doe all these thinges, not with power, but by the permission* » *of God; for the Iewes, that because they would not receaue the charity of* » *Truth, that is the spirit of God by Christ, that receauing our Sauiour* » *they may be saued; God shall send them, not the worker, but the worke* » *or operation, that is, the fountayne of Errour, that they may believe a lye* » &c. And also without the Commentaries of so many Fa- »

» thers, the thing it selfe speaketh, that the Apostle speaketh of
» the Iewes: for he saith that Antichrist is to be sent to those
» who would not receaue Christ. Now, who ought more,
» and would not receaue Christ then the Iewes? Where
» it is also to be noted, that the Apostle sayd not, *because they*
» *will not receaue the Truth*, but, *because they haue not receaued*. Wher-
» fore he speaketh of them who would not belieue when
» Christ and the Apostles preached. Now it is manifest, that
» in the Apostles tyme, the Gentills receaued the Ghospell
» with exceeding great desire, and the Iewes would not
» receaue it.

XIIII. » Moreouer, besides *S. Hierome* & the others already alleaged, all the other Fathers teach the same, as *S. Irenæus lib. 5 S. Hippolytus Mart. orat. de cõsummatione mundi, Theodoret in epit. diuin. decret cap. de Antichristo. Sulpit. ex B. Martino l. 2. dial. S. Cyril catech. 15. S. Hilar. can. 25. in Matth. S. Ambros. l. 10. in Luc. in cap. 21. S. Chrysost. S. August. S. Cyril. Alex. in cap. 5. Ioan. S. Gregor. lib. 31. moral. cap. 10. S. Damascen lib. 4. c. 28.* And reason also perswadeth the same.

XV. » For without doubt Antichrist shall first ioyne himselfe to those who are ready to receaue him. But the Iewes are of this sort who expect their Messias a temporall King, as Antichrist shalbe. But the Christians expect indeed Antichrist, but with feare and terrour, not with ioy and desire. Wherefore as Christ came first to the Iewes to whome he was promised, and of whome he was expected, and afterward drew the Gentills also vnto him. So also Antichrist shall come first to the Iewes, of whome he is expected, and after by little and little, shall subiect all Nations vnto him.

XVI. » Now that Antichrist shalbe a Iew and circumcised, it is certaine, and deduced out of that which hath ben sayd: for the Iewes would neuer receaue one that were no Iew, or that were vncircumcised for their *Messias*. Yea because the Iewes expect their *Messias* of the family of *Dauid* and the Tribe of *Iuda*, without doubt Antichrist although he be truly of the Tribe of *Dan*, will faigne himselfe to be of the family of *Dauid*. Secondly all the Ancients teach most cleerly, that Antichrist shalbe a Iew, as those 12. alleadged a little before, who say that he shalbe of the Tribe of *Dan*; and besides

sides *S. Ambrose*, who in 2. *Thess.* 2. affirmeth that he shalbe circumcised, and *S. Hierome*, who in *cap.* 11. *Dan.* saith that he shalbe borne of the people of the Iewes, and *S. Martin apud Sulpit. l.* 2. *dial.* that Antichrist shall commaund that all be circumcised, according to the law of *Moyses*, and *S. Cyryl*, who *Cateches.* 15. affirmeth, that he shalbe very carefull of the Temple of *Hierusalem*, that he may shew himselfe to be of the progeny of *Dauid*. Finally *S. Gregory* who *lib.* 11. *ep.* 3. saith that Antichrist shalbe a reuerencer of the Saboth and other Iewish Cerimonies. XVII.

Hence we haue a most euident demonstration, that the Pope is not Antichrist. For from the yeare 606. in which our Aduersaryes say that Antichrist came, it is manifest, that no Pope was a Iew, neither by Nation nor by Religion, nor in any sort. It is also manifest, that the Pope was neuer yet receaued by the Iewes for the *Messias*, but contrary wise is accompted their enemy, and chiefe persecutor. Wherefore they in their daily prayers aske of God, that he will giue the Pope the liuing a good mind towards the Iewes, and that in his daies he will send the *Messias*, *viz.* that he may deliuer them out of the Popes power: and they call a Bishop, as chiefly the Pope is, in the *Syrian* language *Zanbon*, which signifieth a Tayle, and is opposite to an head: for because we call the Bishop the *Head* of the people, they contrary wise call him the Tayle in reproach; so farre are they off from being ready to receaue the Pope for their *Messias*.

Finally *Rab. Leui Gerson cap.* 7. and 11. *Dan.* expoundeth all those thinges which are spoken of Antichrist, of the Pope, whom also he calleth another *Pharao*, and opposeth him to the *Messias* which is to come. See *orationes Mahasor, fol.* 26. XVIII.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

1. TO this Argument, first *M. Downam* obiecteth in generall, that in all this disputation *Bellarmine presupposeth, that Antichrist is but one singular person*; which though it See cap. 3.

were

were true, yet he did presuppose nothing but what he had proued before, which I remit to the Readers iudgement. But now indeed this argumẽt presupposeth no such thing, but is of much more force, if we speake of many then if we speake only of one, for it is most euident, that neither all the Popes since 607. were Iewes, nor that the Iewes haue receaued them as their *Messias*: both which thinges shalbe verified in Antichrist, be he one man or many, as *Bellarmine* most certainely proueth.

Downams absurdity.

XII.

I. II. III. IIII. V. VI. VII.

Secondly M. *Downam* noteth briefely three pointes out of the errours which *Bellarmine* reiecteth. First his cunning in that he imitateth *crafty tradesmen, who being desirous to vtter their bad wares at a good price, first shew those that are worse, that the naughtines of the worse may commend and set forth those that be not so bad*. But where *M. Downam* learnt this cunning, or of what tradesmen I know not, except he meaneth those of his owne profession: but sure I am that no tradesman can deale more plainely and sincerely, then *Bellarmine* doth, telling vs what wares are so bad, that by no meanes they are to be dealt withall. Againe what wares are likely to be very good, but yet some doubt may be made of them, which he declareth and vrgeth to the vttermost. Finally what they are also, that are out of all question, being generally warranted by all the most skilfull and honest Merchants. This is *Bellarmines* proceding in this, and all other difficulties, as the Reader may easily perceaue by perusing his workes, and in particuler this place. Now, how this can be disliked by any good and substantiall chapman, I cannot imagine; only some crafty and deceiptfull Merchant may be hindered thereby to vtter his broken trash, and therefore out of enuy cauill at him, as *M. Downam* doth. His second note is, that *S. Hippolytus* is the Father of one of these errors: *vpon whose counterfaite authority* (saith *M. Downam*) *the Papists in other points concerning this controuersy do so much rely*. But if *M. Downam* had asmuch wit, as he hath malice, he might haue noted out of this place in what manner we esteeme the authority of any Father, though neuer so ancient or graue, *viz.* if he holdeth any thing against all the rest, and against a plaine place of Scripture, in the interpretation of which all the

Bellarmines sincere dealing.

rest

reſt agree, we altogeather reiect the authority of that Father. If he affirmeth any thing without euident proofe, in which the reſt are ſilent, and yet he hath probability for that he ſaith, we admit of his authority as probable: and this ſo much the more or leſſe, as we find more or fewer of the Fathers his opinion, or that they affirme it with more certainty and reſolution, or bring better proofes for that they ſay. But yet ſo long as we find any controuerſy among the Fathers, or that they vary in their expoſitions of any place of Scripture, we hould it not altogeather certayne that the greater part affirme, except the matter be decided by the ſucceſſours of *S. Peter*, and the other Paſtors of the Church to whome it doth belong to decyde and define ſuch controuerſies. But when all the Fathers agree it were more then raſhenes, yea plaine madneſſe to goe againſt the whole ſtreame of all antiquity either in opinions belonging to faith, or in the expoſition of the Scripture. And by this *M. Downam* may ſee, that though we eſteeme the authority of *S. Hippolytus* much, yet it alone is no certayne ground of our Faith, though we are farre from reiecting him altogeather, or calling him counterfaite, as *M. Downam* doth, without any other reaſon then that he diſpleaſeth him, as commonly all other Fathers doe. *M. Downams* third obſeruation is, that *theſe opinions* (which *Bellarmine* calleth errours) *ſhew into what abſurdities men doe fall, when as they will needes be comparing Chriſt with Antichriſt, as the Papiſts in many things doe*. But he ſhould haue added, that theſe abſurdityes fall out, when theſe compariſons are made without any ſound or ſufficient ground, which the Papiſts do not in any thing at all, as appeareth plainely by this whole Treatiſe, and may in part be gathered by this, that *Bellarmine* reiecteth thoſe conceipts that were only grounded vpon theſe ſimilitudes, becauſe they were only builded vpon them, and are repugnant to other former groundes.

How Catholikes eſteeme of the Fathers.

2. Thus *M. Downam* paſſeth ouer the errors, and commeth to the two probable opinions, about which he liketh *Bellarmines* iudgement well inough, in that he thinketh neither of them certain, but maketh no mention of the other part in which he affirmeth that the latter is very probable

VIII. IX. X. XI. M. Downams iugling.

bable for the authority of the Fathers. *M. Downam* liketh also so well of *Bellarmines* interpretation of the two first places of Scripture, that he would challeng them to be his owne, or at least to belong to his fellows. For in the first *Gen. 49. Ierem. 8.* he plainely saith, that *Bellarmine answereth with them*; and in the second he relateth it so cunningly, that if the Reader be not very wary, he will easily thinke, that *Bellarmine* were against *S. Hierome*, and that *M. Downam* had found it our.

In the third place, *M. Downam* goeth against *Bellarmine*, affirming that the tribe of *Ephraim* is not left out, but vnderstood by the Tribe of *Ioseph*, in which I like his iudgement very well, for indeed (as *Ribera* and others vpon this place, proue very well) the Tribe of *Ephraim* is in other places called the Tribe of *Ioseph*, as *Psal. 77. Ezech. 37. Amos 5.* and the reason is, because though *Ephraim* were the yonger brother, yet he was preferred before *Manasses* the elder *Gen. 48.* But what hath *M. Downam* gained by this? Is not this rather a confirmation of the Fathers opinion, that Antichrist shalbe borne of the Tribe of *Dan*, since that only was omitted in this place? Yea but (saith *M. Downam*) *Symeon is not mentioned in the blessing of Moyses Deut. 33.* no more then *Dan* in the *Apocalyps*. But he himselfe confesseth, that *Symeon is comprehended vnder Iuda*, but that *Dan* is altogeather omitted, which as you see is a great difference. And besides though *Symeon* were altogeather omitted also, the reason were to be found out and not put off with another difficulty. Wherefore there be two reasons why he was not mentioned by *Moyses*. First because that Tribe was not to haue any particuler possession distinct from the rest in the land of Promise but only some small portion among those of *Iuda*, for which cause, as it seemeth *M. Downam* saith, that *Symeon* is comprehended vnder *Iuda* in this place, to which we may adde that other obseruation of *S. Hierome in quæst. Hebr.* that in processe of tyme, the Tribe of *Symeon* was constrayned to goe into the desert because they had not possession sufficient for them, after they were multiplyed, which he proueth out of *1. Paral. 4.* But though this reason be probable, yet the two *Apollinarij* giue another more certayne, for this reason would

The tribe of Ephraim, not omitted. *Apoc. 7.*

M. Downam impugneth himselfe. *Deut. 33.*

Why Moyses omitted Symeon in his blessing.

would also haue excluded the Tribe of *Leui* which had no particuler possession in the Land of Promise, but was deuided among all the Tribes: for which cause when mention is made of the Tribes in respect of their temporall possessions, the Tribe of *Leui* is omitted. But heere we see, that *Moyses* maketh most honorable mention of *Leui*. Wherfore the two *Apollinary* with whome also agreeth *Caietan*, and *Lippomanus* rather thinke, that *Moyses* made no mention of *Symeon*, by reason of the curse which *Iacob* laid vpon him, togeather with *Leui* vpon his death-bed, from which the Tribe of *Leui* was freed, by the zeale which the shewed in Gods cause against Idolatry at *Moyses* his commandement, by which they wiped away the curse which *Iacob* had laid vpon them for their fury and vniust reuenge, and consecrated their handes to God, and deserued to haue a benediction giuen them as we see that *Moyses* gaue them, absoluing them from their Father *Iacobs* malediction, but passing ouer *Symeon* in silence, & *Deo iudicandum relinquens*, and leauing him to Gods iudgment, as the elder *Apollinarius* writeth, with whom agreeth the assertion of the Iewes, that there was not a poore Scribe nor Schoolemaster among all the Tribes, but he was of the Tribe of *Symeon*, many of them (as it seemeth) beeing constrayned by necessity to seeke their liuing by that meanes, as others were inforced to fly the country, and so *Iacobs* Prophesy was fulfilled in both these Tribes, that they were deuided and dispersed through *Iacob* and *Israel*, but with this difference, that *Leui* liued with great authority and plenty, and *Symeon* in great disgrace and pouerty: which perhaps was also insinuated by the holy Patriarch by those distinct wordes of *deuiding* and *dispersing* in *Iacob* and *Israel*. So that now we haue the reason why *Symeon* was omitted *Deut.* 33. but still we seeke for this other, why *Dan* is omitted *Apoc.* 7. And *M. Downam* giueth vs a generall reason why some one was to be left out, *viz. because Leui was put in, and consequently if all the rest had byn recyted, there should haue ben* 13. Whereas he supposeth that the *Holy Ghost* would neither number more nor lesse then 12. But first this were strange, that the Holy Ghost should stand so precisely vpon any number. And if a Papist should do so, *M. Downam* would

Why the Tribe of Leui is often omitted.

Caiet. in Genes.

Exod. 32.

Why the Tribe of Dan is omitted Apoc. 7.

exclaime against him for superstition. Secondly *Moyses Deut.* 33. indeed numbreth only 11. Tribes, for he includeth *Ephraim* and *Manesses* vnder the name of *Ioseph*; as he himselfe expresseth in the end of his benediction, and M. *Downam* well obserueth that the like is to be seene *Deut.* 27. and *Ezech.* 48. Thirdly our difficulty is not now why any Tribe is omitted; but why rather the Tribe of *Dan* then any other. And to this M. *Downam* answereth, that the reason is, *because that was the first Tribe which fell from God vnto Idolatry: and that for the same cause (as some thinke) the Genealogy of that Tribe is omitted in the first booke of Chronicles.* But this is not a good reason, for though it were true, that the Tribe of *Dan* fell first from God to Idolatry, yet this is no particuler cause, why that Tribe should be omitted only in these two places and in no other; and besides it is not true, that this Tribe fell first to Idolatry: for all the Tribes are said to haue fallen together, when they worshiped the calfe, and after againe *Beelphegor*, which seemeth to be particulerly obiected to the Tribe of *Ruben*, and *Gad*, and the halfe Tribe of *Manasses*, by *Phinees* and the 10. Princes of the other 10. Tribes. And in the tyme of the *Iudges* almost in euery Chapter, there is mention made of the peoples falling to Idolatry without any particuler mention of *Dan*, and euen that particuler Idolatry which M. *Downam* seemeth to ayme at, was not begun by the Tribe of *Dan*, but by *Michas* of the mountayne of *Ephraim* from whome those of *Dan* tooke perforce his idolls and Priest: which indeed was a great sinne in them, but not the first, nor yet the greatest, and therefore not a sufficient reason why the Tribe of *Dan* should be omitted only in these two places, as M. *Downam* will needes affirme against the Fathers, but indeed proueth nothing at all against them. For suppose his reason were good, yet that is no hinderance, why the reason of the Fathers should not be good also: for why might not this Tribe be omitted for both these reasons, and the latter which these Fathers bring be a punishment of the former, which M. *Downam* alleadgeth? For since S. *Iohn* speaketh of those which shalbe saued of the Iewes in the tyme of Antichrist, and only omitteth the Tribe of *Dan*, of which he reckoneth none to be saued, is it not

The Tribe of Dan fell not first to Idolatry

Exod. 32. *Num.* 25 *Ios.* 22.

Iudic. 17. 18.

not more then probable that the cauſe of this is, becauſe the Tribe of *Dan* ſhall wholy giue themſelues to Antichriſt as to the head of their Tribe? And likewiſe ſince the chiefe reaſon why the Genealogyes of the Tribes are rehearſed, is becauſe Chriſt was to be borne of one of them, may it not be very well thought that in hatred of Antichriſt, which was to be of the Tribe of *Dan*, the Genealogy of that Tribe was omitted? though indeed this latter proueth no more of the Tribe of *Dan*, then of diuers other Tribes, whoſe Genealogyes were alſo omitted in that place; and therefore no meruaile, though the Fathers made no inference out of this, as *M. Downam* and ſome of his friends not very wiſely doe.

Antichriſt ſhall be of the Tribe of Dan.

3. *M. Downam* hauing thus agreed with *Bellarmine* in not admitting the Fathers opinion in this point, though he differeth in this, that *Bellarmine* thinketh it very probable for their authority, which he doth not; he would by this preſident proue, that they may lawfully reiect the Fathers authority in all other pointes cõcerning Antichriſt, when it ſeemeth to them the Fathers alleadge not the Scriptures in their true ſenſe. But firſt *M. Downam* muſt remember, that an vniuerſall is not to be inferred from a particuler. Secondly *Bellarmine* reiecteth not the authority of theſe Fathers, but admitteth their opinion as probable, which is aſmuch as they themſelues for the moſt part affirmed, and ſo indeed *Bellarmine* followed them ſo farre as they would haue him. Thirdly *Bellarmine* had the authority of ſome Fathers for his expoſition of the two firſt places, and therefore he might well follow their opinion, eſpecially ſince moſt of the other did rather follow the myſticall, then the litterall ſenſe. In the third place where he brought no authority for himſelfe, *M. Downam* did rightly correct him, ſhewing his inſtance to be very probable, though ſtill there remayneth ſome queſtion why *Ephraim* was not named as well as *Manaſſes*, but comprehended vnder the name of *Ioſeph*. Fourthly therefore *M. Downam* hath no reaſon to reiect all the Fathers, when they agree without contradiction or doubt, nor to make himſelf wiſer then he is, to take vpon him to vnderſtand the Scripture better then they all; yea

Downam impugneth the Fathers authority.

though their arguments out of the Scripture should be only from the mysticall sense, yet he may well assure himselfe, that they would neuer be so resolute, except they had some other good ground of diuine or Apostolicall tradition, known by them to haue ben taught by the Apostles, and from their tyme, from age to age conserued in the Church: for which reason I also incline to thinke that it is in a manner certayne, that Antichrist shalbe of the Tribe of *Dan*, since so many Fathers affirme it without contradiction of any.

XII. 4. But let vs passe ouer this argument as *Bellarmine* doth, making it only probable and not certayne, and come to those others, that are most euident and certayne. Against which M. *Downam* first obiecteth, *that Antichrist shall not be one singular man*: which I haue already shewed to be both false and impertinent. Secondly he saith, that *these opinions may be disproued by Scripture, because Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God, that is, shall raigne in the Church of Christ*. But of this we shall haue occasion to treat afterward. Besides saith he, *Bellarmine confesseth, that Antichrist shalbe the head of the Apostasy, that is, backesliding Christians*, Ergo, *not of the Iewes*. But M. *Downam* might easily haue considered, that Antichrist may be the head of both, as *Bellarmine* affirmeth. After this he noteth that Antichrist shalbe *head of the Roman State, and haue his Seate in Rome*, which how true it is we shall see afterward. Now I would faine know why a Iew may not haue both these cõditions. Lastly M. *Downam* would know, when the Iewes *shalbe called to Christ?* To which I answere that some shalbe called in Antichrists raigne, but the most after his fall, which shalbe not long before the end of the world, as we haue already seene in part.

num. 1.

See Cap. 13.

See cap. 13.

XII. 5. Thus hath this wise man shot his bolt, and now he holdeth vp his buckler to beare off *Bellarmines* Artillery: and first to the testimony of *S. Iohn* 5. 43. he saith, that *he hath proued before, that our Sauiour speaketh not absolutely but conditionally, not definitely, but indefinitely, and only of the Iewes present which are dead long since*: but all these shiftes are confuted long since at large, and therefore it were needeles to repeat them, or confute them heere againe.

Io. 5.

Cap. 2.

6. The

6. The second testimony 2. *Thess.* 2. troubleth him somewhat more, and therefore his tongue runneth at ran- 2. *Thess.* 2.
dome, explicating the place at large after his owne fancy and railing against Catholikes, but obiecteth nothing worth the answering: the most that he hath to the purpose is, that the Apostles wordes may be applyed to all others that follow Antichrist aswell as to the Iewes. In which we will not stand with him; but now our question is, whether the Iewes be included in these wordes or no, and *Bellarmine* saith they are, and that chiefly: and this he proueth out of the Scripture it selfe. First because none ought more, and would lesse receaue Christ then the Iewes.

7. To which *M. Downam* answereth not a word, but that the *Rhemists* confesse, that others may be said not to receaue the loue of the Truth also. But what is this to the purpose? Doe the *Rhemists*, or can any other deny that none refused more to receaue the loue of the Truth then the Iewes? And yet this is all the answere, that *M. Downam* giueth, but falleth into a rage, and railing againe like a man more then halfe beside himselfe; yet after a while, he commeth to himselfe againe, and returneth to *Bellarmines* second proofe out of the Scripture, where he noteth, that the Apostle speake in the preter tense, of the refusers to receaue the Truth, and in the future tense of the comming & receauing of Antichrist: out of which he inferreth, that he is to be vnderstood of the Iewes, who were they that chiefly had refused to receaue Christ in the Apostles tyme. To which *M. Downam* answereth, that *this preter tense is not to be referred to the tyme of the Apostles writing, but to the tyme of their punishment.* By which as you see, he maketh the preter and future tense all one, or at least ioyneth them togeather, expounding the later part of the Apostles words in English thus: *That all may be condemned, that shall not haue believed the Truth, but shall haue delighted in iniquity*, and willing vs to conferre this place with *Mar.* 16. 16. which he likewise expoundeth in the same manner: *He that shall haue believed, and shall haue ben baptized, shalbe saued; but he that shall not haue believed, shalbe condemned*, though in both places, he is inforced to confesse that the greeke is the preter tense, and he dareth not translate it otherwise:

wise, howsoeuer he expoundes it. So that vnlesse we will stand to *M. Downams* exposition rather then to the wordes of the Scripture, we are to vnderstand all this of the preter tense only, as the condemnation, and the receauing of Antichrist in the future tense only, which is a plaine signe, that all this is not to be vnderstood of the same tyme, as is also euident by the thing it selfe, for men refuse to beleiue, and to be baptized in this life when they are preached vnto, but they are condemned in the other life, when all Sermons are at an end for them. And this our Sauiours words signify most exactely, if *M. Downams* commentary be taken away. And yet the matter is more cleere in the words, which *Bellarmine* vrgeth, in which there is no Participle in the Greeke, as in the places which *M. Downam* compareth, but the Verbe it selfe; which cannot well be vnderstood, but of things truly past, as neither the Verbe in the future tense, but of thinges truly to come; and since the Apostle limitteth not that preter tense to any other tyme, as our Sauiour doth: it must be vnderstood to signify that, which was past before the tyme of his writing. But *M. Downam* obiecteth further, that *if Bellarmine will needes vrge the preter tense, as though the Apostle meant that Antichrist should be receaued only of those, who before that tyme had reiected the truth, he must withall hould, that Antichrist shalbe receaued in the end of the world of those who dyed aboue 1500. yeares since.* But this is both a false, and friuolous obiection: false, becauſe it addeth the word (*only*) which *Bellarmine* hath not, for he neuer went about to prooue, that only the Iewes should receaue Antichrist, but that they should receaue him: friuolous, becauſe the Apostle & *Bellarmine* also speake of the Nation of the Iewes, and not of any particuler men, as is manifest to any that is not wilfully blinded with malice, of which number it grieueth me that *M. Downam* will needes be one.

Downam falsifieth Bellarmines wordes.

XII. XIII. XIIII. 8. To the authority of the Fathers, *M. Downam* briefly answereth, that there *is no probability in their* assertion or exposition no more then in the former, that Antichrist *should be of the Tribe of Dan*, or in their expositions of the places of Scripture, which they brought to that effect, *which* (sayth he) *no man now, vnles he wilbe too ridiculous can vnderstand of Antichrist.*

christ. Where I desire the Reader to cõsider the little accompt that *M. Downam* maketh of al the Fathers, when they make against him: and as for his similitude, I haue already shewed how vnlike it is, aswell because the Fathers speake not resolutly thẽselues in that point, as they do in this, and also because all the Fathers do not agree in that assertion or exposition. And yet *M. Downam* is very insolent in condemning all for ridiculous, which follow the Fathers exposition of those places of Scripture: for first there is no doubt, but that the two former may be mystically so vnderstood, and the last can haue no other probable sense, as hath sufficiently appeared. Neither is that obiection of his worth the answering, by which he would proue, that the Fathers might aswell proue, that Antichrist shall be of the Tribe of *Beniamin*, because of him it is said in the same place, that he *shall raigne as a wolfe*, for *M. Downam* might haue added the other clause, which is to be taken in good part, and therfore cannot be applied to Antichrist, but to some other who shall change his condition, and of a rauening wolfe become a glorious Preacher, and Apostle of Christ, as *S. Paul* did, of whom some of the Fathers mistically expound those words. Wherfore *M. Downam* must be content, though much against his will, that both these assertions and expositions haue that probability and certainty, which the Fathers affirme that they haue, as *Bellarmine* hath sufficiently declared.

Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

num. 2.

9. Lastly to *Bellarmines* reason *M. Downam* answereth, that *Antichrist shall ioyne himselfe, not to any whatsoeuer, but to those in the Church, that are ready to receaue him*. For proofe wherof he alleadgeth *S. Cyprian epist.* 1. *lib.* 1. where he affirmeth that the *Diuell troubleth the seruants of God, and Antichrist impugneth Christians, and seeketh not those whome he hath already subdued, or desireth to ouerthrow those whome he hath already made his owne &c.* Which in truth is a strange proofe (if you marke it well) for *Bellarmine* speaketh not a word of *troubling, impugning, or ouerthrowing*, but only of ioyning with the Iewes as with friends; and *M. Downam* to proue, that Antichrist shall not ioyne with them, so alleadgeth *S. Cyprian*, who affirmeth that he shall impugne Christians. Would any man take *M.*

XV.

M. Downam ridiculously impugneth himselfe.

Downam for a Doctor or Reader of Diuinity, that should heare him dispute thus grossely, bringing *quid, pro quo*, and impugning himselfe insteed of his aduersary? But let vs pitty his folly, and affirme with *S. Cyprian* and *Bellarmine*, that Antichrist shall impugne Christians, and to that effect, first ioyne himselfe to the Iewes. To *Bellarmines minor*, that the Iewes are ready to receaue Antichrist, *M. Downam* hath nothing to answere directly, but only repeateth certaine assertions of his owne, that Antichrist *shall not be one particuler man &c.* which haue, and shall be confuted in their due places.

But now *M. Downam* should haue impugned *Bellarmines* proofe, which is, that the Iewes expect a temporall King, as Antichrist shall be, and not only affirme vpon his bare word, that *Antichrist shall not be such a one, as the expected Messias of the Iewes, and that there is no necessity, that there should such a one come to the Iewes as they expect:* both which assertiõs are ouerthrown by *Bellarmines* reasons and other proofes. And to the second part, that Christians expect Antichrist with feare and terrour, *M. Downam* only answereth, *that vnsound and back-sliding Christians, are ready to receaue Antichrist*. By which, if he meaneth, that they are in great danger to be drawne to him by little and little, it is very true, and that which *Bellarmine* affirmeth: but if he would say, that they expect Antichrist with ioy and desire, as the Iewes do, he is farre wide: for the Iewes will receaue him the sooner because he is against Christ, which very few Christians though neuer so vnsound will yield to at the first, but rather be terrified with the very mention therof, as *M. Downam* may experience amongst Protestants, whome we accompt vnsound Christians, and the world will testify of all Catholikes, whome he taketh to be such. Now for his supposition, that Antichirst is come, and that the Pope is Antichrist, we know this to be the question and maine controuersy, and therfore cannot but acknowledg *M. Downams* ordinary fault, which is *petitio principij*.

The difference betwixt Christians and Iewes in expecting Antichrist.

XVI. 10. *M. Downam* hauing thus worthily answered *Bellarmines* first certaine position, he commeth to the second, which is, that Antichrist shall be a Iew: which *Bellarmine* pro-

proueth out of his former aſſertion, that the Iewes ſhall receaue Antichriſt, which they would neuer do, except he were a Iew. To which *M. Downam* anſwereth, that he hath *ouerthrowne that former aſſertion*: which how true it is, I remit to the Readers iudgment. Secondly he obiecteth, that *the Herodians receaued Herod for their Meſſias*, but he doth well not to ſtand vpon this; for the ſolution is euident, for theſe *Herodians* were a few flattering Courtiers, & now we ſpeake of the whole Nation of the Iewes, and chiefly of thoſe great Rabbynes who profeſſe ſo great knowledge in Scripture, which teacheth moſt euidently, that the Meſſias is to be of the Iewiſh nation, and the Tribe of *Iuda*, though for this ſecond, they cannot now much ſtriue, becauſe their Genealogies are ſo confounded: and ſo it willbe no hard matter for Antichriſt to be taken for one of the Tribe of *Iuda*, though indeed he be of the Tribe of *Dan*.

Antichriſt ſhall be a Iew.

The Herodians.

To the authority of the Fathers, he anſwereth according to his cuſtome, that *they are not to be believed in this point which hath no ground in the word of God*, and ſtill he inſiſteth vpon *Bellarmines* reiecting the twelue Fathers which affirmed, that Antichriſt ſhould be of the Tribe of *Dan* for the ſame reaſons. But he abuſeth both *Bellarmine* and the Fathers, as the Reader may eaſily ſee. *Bellarmine*, for he reiecteth not the Fathers authority, but imbraceth it as very probable, which was as much as the moſt of them affirmed. The Fathers, becauſe he reiecteth them all in a thing, wherin they agree as certaine, which they would neuer do without ſome certaine ground either of Apoſtolicall tradition, or Scripture, and reaſon, which *Bellarmine* hath ſufficiently explicated in his former aſſertion.

Downam reiecteth the Fathers.

Finally *M. Downam* briefly paſſeth ouer the oppoſition which *Bellarmine* ſheweth that the Iewes haue againſt the Pope, becauſe he was aſhamed to ſee what Iewes the Proteſtants are in this behalfe: but yet he is content to take hold of their application, of the Propheſies of *Daniel* againſt the Pope, becauſe *they are no parties*, and therfore their authority *may be ſome inducement*, to thinke indeed that the Pope is Antichriſt: where I could wiſh the Reader to marke attentiuely, the great connexion betwixt Iewes and Proteſtants

XVII. XVIII.

The Iews oppoſite to the Pope.

in this point of impugning the Pope, though vpon different grounds. For if you examine a Iew, why he is so eager against the Pope, he will tell you, that it is, because he hateth Christ himselfe, and for his sake all Christians, but chiefly the Pope, who is the chiefe of them. Againe if you pose *M. Downam* with the same question, why he cannot abide the Pope? He will tell you another tale, that it is, because he loueth Christ and all true Christians, to whome he thinketh the Pope and his adherents to be most opposite. And is it not strange, that these men should ioyne in the expositions of Scripture? Yea that *M. Downam* should take the Iew to be no party against the Pope, but an indifferent man, and therfore thinketh his exposition fit to be some inducement to make men belieue his doctrine? Is it not too plaine, that *M. Downam* is in the high way to deny Christ, howsoeuer he protesteth the contrary, since he hateth the Pope, whome the Iewes only detest out of their malice to Christ himselfe? True it is, that the consequence is not so necessary from the hatred of the Pope to the hatred of Christ, as contrariwise, but yet he that is come so farre, as to hate Christs most principal seruant in the highest degree, and with vnplacable hatred, may easily be carried a step further, except God giue him grace to turne back in time, which I most hartily wish for *M. Downam* himselfe, and all others, that are in that most miserable and dangerous estate.

How the Iewes and the Protestats agree and differ in impugning the Pope.

THE

THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER.

Of Antichriſts Seate.

TOVCHING the ſixt (ſaith *Bellarmine*) our Aduerſaries bouldly affirme, that the I. chiefe Seat of Antichriſt is *Rome*, or the Apoſtolike Chaire founded there: for they ſay, that Antichriſt ſhall inuade the Sea of *Peter*, and raiſe it vp to a certaine ſoueraigne height, from the which it ſhall rule and tyrannicly gouerne the whole Church. And that *Rome* is the Kingly Citty of Antichriſt, they proue out of *Apoc.* 17. where *S. Iohn* ſpeaking of the Seate of Antichriſt ſaith, that it is the great Citty which is ſcituated vpon ſeauen hills, and which hath the Kingdome ouer the Kings of the earth.

And that at *Rome*, not in the pallace of *Nero*, but in the III. very Church of Chriſt, Antichriſt ſhall haue his Seate, they proue out of *S. Paul*, who 2. *Theſſ.* 2. ſaith: that Antichriſt *ſhall ſit in the Temple of God*: for ſince he ſaith abſolutly in the *Temple of God*, he meaneth the true Temple of the true God, and there is none ſuch, but the Church of God. For the Temples of the Gentiles are true Temples, but of the Diuels, not of God. And the Temple of the Iewes was in-

» deed of God, but it ceased to be a Temple, when the Iewish sacrifice and Priesthood ceased: for these three are so ioyned, that one cannot be without the other. Besides the Temple of the Iewes, within a while after, was to be desolated, and neuer to be built againe, as *Dan. cap.* 9. saith: » *and the desolation shall persenere till the consummation, and the end.* » Wherfore the Apostle cannot speake of it.

III. And this argument is confirmed out of the Fathers. *S.* » *Hierome quæst.* 11. *ad Algasiam: He shall sit* (saith he) *in the Temple of God, either at Hierusalem as some thinke, or in the Church, as we thinke more truly*: and *Oecumenius, He saith not* (saith he) *the Temple of Ierusalem, but the Churches of Christ.*

IIII. *Theodorus Bibliander* addeth the testmony of *S. Greg.* who *l.* 4. *ep.* 38. *ad Ioan. Constantinopolitanũ* saith: *The king of pride is nigh, and (which is impious to be spoken) an army of Priests is prepared for him*. Out of which words a double argument is drawne, one thus: *Iohn* of *Constantinople* is sayd to forerun Antichrist, because he will be called the vniuersall Bishop; therfore he shall be Antichrist, who in very deed shall make himselfe the Vniuersall Bishop, and shall sit in the Church, as the head of all. The other thus: The army of Antichrist shall be Priests, therfore Antichrist shall be the head of Priests. By which arguments the heretikes thinke, that they euidently shew, that the Bishop of *Rome* is Antichrist, since he ruleth at *Rome*, sitteth in the Temple of God, and is called the vniuersall Bishop, and is the Prince of Priests.

V. Notwithstanding the true opinion is, that *Hierusalem* and not *Rome*, shall be the seat of Antichrist, and the Temple of *Salomon*, and Throne of *Dauid*, not the Temple of *S. Peter*, or the Sea Apostolike, which we can proue in two sorts: First with an argument *ad hominem*. Secondly out of the Scripture and Fathers.

VI. First then I make this argument: Antichrist shall sit in the Church of Christ, and shall be accompted the Prince & head of his Church, and shall haue Magistracy and offices in it, as *Philippus Melancton in apologia art.* 6. *confess. Augustanæ*, *Caluinus lib.* 4. *Iustit. cap.* 2. §. 12. *& cap.* 7. §. 25. *Illyricus sent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. *col.* 435. and all other Sectaries of this time do teach: but the Pope of *Rome* is Antichrist, as they them-

themselues also teach in the same places. Therfore the Pope of *Rome* sitteth in the true Church of Christ, and is the Prince and head of his Church. But the Church of Christ can only be one, as Christ is one, as *Caluin* also teacheth *lib. 4. Instit. cap. 1. §. 2.* Therfore the *Lutherans* and *Caluinists*, and as many as are out of the Church which is vnder the Pope, are out of the true Church.

VII. *Caluin* saw this argument, and answered, that not so much the Church, as the ruines of the Church of Christ are seene vnder the Pope. For thus he speaketh, *lib. 4. Instit. cap. 2. §. 11. As there remained in old tyme certaine peculiar prerogatiues of the Church vnder the Iewes; so neither at these daies do we take from the Papists the steps of the Church, which the Lord would haue remaining among them of the dissipation.* And after: *God hath wrought with his prouidence, that there should be also other remnants extant, least the Church should wholy perish. And as buildings are often so throwne downe, that the foundations and ruines remaine, so he hath not suffered his Church to be either subuerted from the foundation, or quite throwne downe by Antichrist, or els he would haue the building halfe saued from destruction.* And againe §. 12. *VVherfore hence it is manifest, that we deny not, that the Churches remayne euen vnder his Tyranny.*

VIII. But this solution affoardeth vs two arguments. The first; if only the ruines of Christs Church remaine: then the Church of Christ is fallen. Wherfore the truth hath lyed, which sayd *Matth. 16. and the Gates of hell shall not preuaile against it.* The other, the Church is fallen, and the Papists hold the ruines of it, and the foundation, yea the building it selfe halfe throwne downe: Then the *Lutherans* and *Caluinists* haue no Church, for they haue not the whole and entire Church of Christ, for that is fallen, and the ruines yet remaine; neither haue they it halfe throwne downe, for that is among the Papists vnder Antichrist. What haue they the? Perhaps a new building, but in that it is new, it is not Christs. And who that is not altogeather blind seeth not, that it is more safe to remaine in the true Church of Christ, although halfe throwne downe, then in none?

IX. Now I come to the Scriptures, by which it is proued, that *Hierusalem*, and not *Rome* shall be the seat of Antichrist. The first is *in Cap. 11. Apoc.* where *S. Iohn* saith: That *Enoch* and

» and *Helias* ſhall fight with Antichriſt in *Ieruſalem*, and be
» ſlaine there by him, *and their bodies* (ſaith he) *ſhall lye in the ſtreets*
» *of the great Citty, which is ſpiritually called Sodome, and Ægipt, where*
» *alſo their Lord was crucified*: vpon which place *Arethas*; *Their bo-*
» *dies* (ſaith he) *ſhall be caſt vnburied in the ſtreets of Hieruſalem, for he*
» *ſhall raigne in that Citty, as King of the Iewes*. In like manner do
» all other Interpreters expound it, and ſurely it can by no
» meanes be denyed, that this is ſpoken of *Ieruſalem*: for what
» Citty is there where our Lord was crucified, but *Ieruſalem*?

X. » Wherfore *Chytræus* who would haue this Citty to be
» *Rome*, letteth paſſe thoſe words (where alſo their Lord was
» crucified) as though they were not to the purpoſe. Neither
» is it any hindrance, that *S. Hierome in ep. 17. ad Marcellam*,
» endeauoureth to ſhew that *Hieruſalem* cānot be called *Sodome*,
» ſince that euery where in Scripture it is called the holy Cit-
» ty; for in that Epiſtle, he perſwadeth *Marcella* to forſake
» *Rome*, and come into *Paleſtine*, and therfore he heapeth vp all
» that he can in the praiſe of *Hieruſalem*, and in the reprehen-
» ſion of *Rome*, and endeauoureth by all meanes to excuſe *Hie-*
» *ruſalem*. Neither doth he it in his owne name, but in the
» name of *Paula* and *Euſtochium*, whome he thought ought to
» be pardoned, if they explicated any thing ſomewhat other-
» wiſe then it was. For that earthly *Hieruſalem* may be called
» *Sodome*, for luſt and offences of the Iewes, is manifeſt out of
» *Iſaias*, who in his firſt Chapter, when he had prefixed the
» title: *The viſion of Iſaias, which he ſaw vpon Iuda and Hieruſalem*,
» addeth forthwith: *Heare the word of our Lord you Princes of So-*
» *dome, harken with your eares the law of my God you people of Gomor-*
» *rha*.

» Neither is that a good argument; *Hieruſalem* is called
XI. » holy, therfore it cannot be called *Sodome*, for as *S. Hierome*
» ſayth in the ſame Epiſtle, that *Rome* is called *Babylon*, and the
» purple harlot by *S. Iohn*, by reaſon of the Pagan Emperours,
» and yet that it is holy, by reaſon of the Church of Chriſt,
» & the Sepulchers of *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*: ſo alſo *Ieruſalem* is an
» holy Citty, by reaſon of the Prophets and Apoſtles which
» preached there of the Croſſe, and Sepulcher of Chriſt, and
» the like, and yet it is *Sodome* and *Ægipt*, by reaſon of the of-
» fences and blindnes of the vnbelieuing Iewes.

The

The ſecõd place is *Apoc.* 17. where *S. Iohn* ſaith, that the 10. Kings who ſhal deuide the *Romã* Empire among thẽſelues, & in whoſe raigne Antichriſt ſhal come, *wil hate the purple Harlot,* that is *Rome,* & *wil make her deſolate, & wil burne her with fire:* How then ſhall it be the ſeate of Antichriſt, if it muſt be ouerthrowne, and burnt at that very time? XII.

Beſides, as we proued before, Antichriſt ſhal be a Iew, & the *Meſſias*, and King of the Iewes. Wherfore without doubt, he ſhal place his ſeat in *Ieruſalem*, & will go about to reſtore the Tẽple of *Salomõ*, for the Iewes dreame of nothing els, but of *Hieruſalẽ*, & of the *Temple*: Neither doth it ſeeme, that they wil euer accept any for their *Meſſias* who ſhal not ſit in *Hieruſalem*, & reſtore the Tẽple in ſome ſort. Wherfore *Lactantius l.* 7. *c.* 15. ſaith: that in the time of Antichriſt the chiefeſt Kingdome ſhall be in *Aſia*, & that the Weſt ſhall ſerue, & the Eaſt rule, and *c.* 17. he determineth the part of *Aſia*, in which this Kingdome ſhal be, & ſaith: that it is *Syria*, that is *Iudæa*, which is part of *Syria*, and which is alway called *Syria* by the *Latins*. Likewiſe *S. Hierom* & *Theodoret in c.* 11. *Dan.* gather out of *Dan.* that Antichriſt ſhal fix his tents in the coũtry of *Ieruſalem*, & at length be ſlaine in the Mount *Oliuet*, and *S. Irenæus l.* 5. ſaid plainely, that Antichriſt ſhall raigne in earthly *Ieruſalem*. XIII.

The third place, is in thoſe words of *S. Paul*, 2. *Theſſ.* 2. *So that he ſhall ſit in the Temple of God*. For although there be many expoſitions giuen by the Fathers, and ſome vnderſtand the minds of the faithful, in which Antichriſt is ſaid to ſit, whẽ he hath ſeduced them, as *S. Anſelme* expoundeth it; & ſome by the *Temple* vnderſtãd Antichriſt himſelfe with all his people, for Antichriſt will deſire to haue himſelfe and his ſeeme the ſpiritual *Temple* of God, that is, the true Church, as *S. Auguſtine* expoundeth it *l.* 20. *Ciuit. Dei c.* 19. where he deduceth this expoſition out of the manner of *S. Pauls* ſpeaking, who ſayd not in Greeke ἐν τῷ ναῷ, *in Templo*, but εἰς τὸν ναὸν, *in Templum* as if he ſhould ſay that Antichriſt ſhal ſit *in Templũ Dei*, that is as though he and his were the Tẽple *of God*, although this annotation of *S. Auguſt.* is not neceſſary, for though in Latine we cannot wel ſay *ſedere in Templũ*, for *in Templo*, yet in greeke it is not euill ſaid καθίζομαι εἰς τὸν ἐκκλησίαν, or εἰς τὸν ναὸν, yea it is commonly ſo ſaid. XIV.

» Some also vnderstand the Churches of Christians,
XV. » which Antichrist shall command to serue him, as *S. Chrysostome* interpreteth it: yet the more common, more probable,
» and the more litterall exposition is of them, who teach
» that the temple of *Salomon* is vnderstood by the *Temple of God*,
» in which after some sort repaired, Antichrist shall sit. For
» first, in the Scripture of the new Testament, the Churches
» of Christians are neuer vnderstood by the *Temple of God*, but
» alway the *Temple of Hierusalem*: and that which is more, the
» ancient Fathers Latine and Greeke, for some ages, neuer
» called the Churches of Christians, *Temples*, which in greeke
» are called ναοὶ, as in this place of *S. Paul*, but they called
» them εὐκτήρια, that is, *Oratoria*, *Ecclesias*, *Domos orationis*, *Basilicas*, *Martyria*.

XVI. » Certainely, neither *S. Iustine*, nor *S. Irenæus*, nor *Tertullian*, nor *S. Cyprian* do vse the name of *Temple*, when they
» treat of the Churches of Christians: and *S. Ierome ep. ad Riparium* saith, that *Iulian* the *Apostata* commanded that the
* *Basilicæ*. » * *Churches* of the Saints should either be destroyed, or turned into Temples.

XVII. » And the reasons why the Apostles call not the Churches of Christians *Temples*, are two: the one, because then
» they had not any Temples, but only in priuate houses they
» appointed certayn places for praier, Sermons, and saying of
» Masse. The other reason is, because the memory of the Iewish *Temple* was fresh, least the Apostles might seeme to bring
» in some thing like to them, and that they might distinguish
» the Church from the Synagogue, they abstained from the
» name of *Temple*. As also for the same reason the Apostles in
» the Scripture, neuer call Christian Priests *Sacerdotes*, but
» only *Episcopos*, and *Presbyteros*. But after that *Hierusalem* was ouerthrowne, and the *Temple* burnt, and the memory of the
» old Temple and Priesthood abolished, the holy Doctors
» began to vse commonly the name of Temple and Priesthood.

XVIII. » Since therfore the Apostle writing, that Antichrist
» shall sit in the *Temple of God*, said somthing which he would
» haue vnderstood of them, to whome he wrote, and they
» then did not vnderstād by the name of *Temple*, any other but

the

the Temple of Hieruſalem, it ſeemeth certaine that the Apoſtle ſpake of it, which is alſo confirmed by the common expoſition of the Fathers, S. Irenæus lib. 5. When Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Temple of Hieruſalem, then our Lord will come &c. S. Hippolytus Mart. orat. de mundi conſummat. He ſhall build the Temple at Hieruſalem. And S. Martin apud Sulpitium, lib. 2. dial. teacheth the ſame. S. Cyril. Hieroſol. catechef. 15. What manner of Temple meaneth the Apoſtle? In the Temple of the Iewes which is remayning: for God forbid that it ſhould be done in this, in which we are. And S. Hilary can. 25. in Matt. Antichriſt being receaued of the Iewes, ſhall ſtay in the place of Sanctification. Where he plainly ſpeaketh of the Temple of the Iewes, for he calleth the place of Sanctification, that which Chriſt Matth. 24. calleth the holy Place, when he ſaith: When you ſee abhomination ſtanding in the holy place.

S. Ambroſe inc. 21. Luc. ſaith, that Antichriſt according to XIX. the hiſtory, ſhall ſit in the Temple, into which the Romans caſt the head of a ſwine, in the time of the Emperour Titus, and according to the myſticall ſenſe, that he ſhall ſit in the inward Temple of the Iewes, that is, in their perfidious minds.

Sedulius vpon this place of the Apoſtle explicateth, that XX. in the Temple of God, He will endeauour to repaire the temple of Hieruſalem &c. S. Damaſcen lib. 4. cap. 28. In the Temple (ſayth he) not ours, but the old Iewiſh. S. Chryſoſtome, Theodoret, and Theophilact, who ſay, that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Churches of Chriſtians, affirme alſo, that he ſhall ſit in the Temple of Salomon, for S. Chryſoſtome writeth thus vpon this place: He ſhall command himſelfe to be worſhipped for God, and to be placed in the Temple, not only of Hieruſalem, but alſo in the Churches. The ſame ſay Theophilact and Theodoret. S. Auguſtine alſo lib. 20. Ciuit. Dei cap. 19. & S. Hierome quæſt. 11. ad Algaſiam, do not deny that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Temple of Salomon.

Only Oecumenius denieth, that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in XXI. the Temple of the Iewes: but he is the laſt of all, and by no meanes to be preferred before all the Fathers; perhaps alſo his text is corrupted, & there wanteth but one particle (only) for it is not credible that he would depart from S. Chryſoſtome Theodoret, and Theophilact, whome in all other things he alway followeth.

Now let vs answere to the arguments of our Aduersa-
XXII. ries, which we proposed before. To the first I answere in three manners. First it may be sayd with *S. Augustine in psal.* 26. *Arethas, Haymo, Bede*, and *Rupert. in cap.* 17. *Apoc.* that by the Harlot, which sitteth vpon seauen hills, and hath her Kingdome ouer the Kings of the earth, *Rome* is not vnderstood, but the whole Citty of the Diuel, which in the Scripture is often called *Babylon*, and is opposed to the Citty of God, that is, to the Church, which is called *Hierusalem*, and that by the seauen hils is vnderstood the vniuersality of the proud, and chiefly of the Kings of the earth.

XXIII. Secondly it may be sayd, and in my iudgment better, that by the harlot is vnderstood *Rome*, as *Tertull. l. cont. Iudeos & lib.* 3. *cont. Martian.* and *S. Hierome ep.* 17. *ad Marcellam, & quæst.* 11. *ad Algasiam*, but Ethnick *Rome* raigning, worshipping Idols, and persecuting Christians, and not *Rome* Christian, for so those Authors expound.

XXIV. And surely meruailous is the impudency of Heretikes who to proue that the Roman Church is the purple Harlot, vse the testimony of *Tertullian* and *S. Hierome*; for since at that time *Heathen Rome* was contrary to *Christian Rome*, which of them I pray you, do those Fathers call the purple Harlot? If heathen *Rome*, why then do the Heretikes abuse their testimonies? If Christian *Rome*, it followeth that the Roman Church had degenerated then, and Antichrist did raigne then, which they themselues do not graunt.

XXV. Furthermore if Christian *Rome* was *Babylon* then, why doth *Tertullian de præscript.* say: *Happy Church to which the Apostles powred out their whole doctrine with their bloud?* And why doth *S. Hierome lib.* 2. *cont. Iouinianum* in the end speaking to *Rome*, say: *Shall I speake to thee, who hast wiped away the blasphemy written in thy forehead, with the confession of Christ?* Finally the same is manifest out of *S. Iohn* himselfe, who saith, that he speaketh of that *Rome*, who held the Empire *ouer the Kings of the earth, and which was drunke with the bloud of Saints, and with the bloud of the Martyrs of Iesus*, which certainly haue not place, but in that *Rome*, which in the raigne of *Nero* and *Domitian* slew the Martyrs.

XXVI. Thirdly I say, although that Woman were Christian

Rome

Rome, as the heretikes would haue it, yet their argument hath no force at all: for as we shewed before, Antichrist *shall hate Rome*, and fight with it, and consume and burne it, out of which it manifestly followeth, that *Rome* shall not be the seate of Antichrist.

To the second we haue already said, that *S. Paul* in that place speaketh of the Temple of *Salomon*, and to the reason which we made, I answere, that the Iewish Sacrifice and Priesthood ceasing, the Temple also ceased to be the Iewish Temple, but it ceased not forthwith to be the tẽple of God, for the same Temple might be the Temple of Christians, and indeed it was so, so long as it remained: for the Apostles preached in it, and prayed, after the Ascension of Christ, and the comming of the Holy Ghost, as is manifest by those words *Luc. vltimo: They were alway in the Temple praysing and blessing our Lord*. Likewise *Act. 3. Peter and Iohn went vp into the Temple at the ninth houre of prayer:* and *Act. 5.* the Angell sayth to the Apostles: *Speake in the Temple to the people all the words of this life.* XXVII.

To that of *Daniel* I answere, that eyther *Daniel* would say, that the Temple is not to be built againe, but in the end of the world, which is true, for Antichrist shall not come but in the end of the world, or that the desolation shall remaine for euer, because though it were built againe, yet the Temple should neuer be but prophaned after the ouerthrow made by *Titus*: for when it shall be erected by Antichrist, thẽ chiefly shall the abhomination of desolation remaine in it, that is Antichrist himselfe, or his Image: or finally, that the Temple should neuer be perfectly built againe, but yet that the building should be begun, & that Antichrist should sit in the Temple begun in some sort. XXVIII.

To the places of the Fathers we haue already answered, that they affirme, or at least deny not, that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of *Salomon*, and wheras many of thẽ add, that Antichrist shall also sit in the Churches of Christians, it is true, and not contrary to vs, for the Fathers meane not that Antichrist shall sit in the Church as a Bishop, as Heretikes dreame, but that he shall sit as God. For Antichrist shall command that all the Temples of the whole world be conuerted XXIX.

» uerted to his worship, and he will make himselfe to be ado-
» red in them. *He will command* (saith *S. Chrysostome* in this place)
» *himselfe to be worshiped, and reuerenced for God, and to be placed in the*
» *Temple, not only of Hierusalem, but also in the Churches*: and the rest
» speake in the same manner.

» To the arguments taken out of the words of *S. Gregory*
XXX. » I answere, that out of his words the contrary of that is de-
» duced which the heretikes infer, for they argue thus: The
» Bishop of *Constantinople* did forerun Antichrist, because he
» made himselfe the *Vniuersall Bishop*, therefore Antichrist shall
» be some *Vniuersall Bishop*, who shall vsurpe all to himselfe.
» But the contrary is inferred, for the forerunner is not to be
» the same with him whome he forerunneth, but farre lesse,
» though like him in some thing, as appeareth in *S. Iohn Bap-*
» *tist*, and Christ. If therfore the forerunner of Antichrist be
» he, who maketh himselfe the vniuersall Bishop, the true
» Antichrist himselfe shall not make himselfe that, but some
» other thing greater, *viz.* he shall extoll himselfe aboue all
» that is called God: or if the true Antichrist shall only make
» himselfe the *Vniuersall Bishop*, that *Iohn* of *Constantinople*, who did
» this, was not the forerunner of Antichrist, but the true An-
» tichrist himselfe, which notwithstanding neither *S. Gre-*
» *gory*, nor our Aduersaries say. Wherfore the sense of *S. Gre-*
» *gories* words is, that because Antichrist shall be most proud,
» and the head of all the proud, so that he will not suffer any
» equalls, therfore whosoeuer vsurpeth to himselfe any thing
» otherwise then he ought, and will exceed and surpasse o-
» thers, is his forerunner: and such were the Bishops of *Con-*
» *stantinople*, who being in the beginning but Archbishops, first
» vsurped to themselues to be Patriarches, and after the title
» of *Vniuersall*.

XXXI. » In like manner when *S. Gregory* sayth, *an army of Priests*
» *is prepared for him*, he meaneth not, that Priests, as Priests, be-
» long to the army of Antichrist, for so he should haue put
» himselfe in that army, but that Priests as they are proude,
» prepare an army for Antichrist: for he speaketh of the same
» *Iohn*, and of Priests like him, who were extolled aboue the
» rest vniustly. But hence it followeth not, that Antichrist
» shall be the Prince of Priests, but that he shall be the Prince

of

of the Proud.

Out of this sixt head we haue a notable argument, that the Pope is not Antichrist, since his Seate is not *Ierusalem*, nor in the Temple of *Salomon*, yea it is credible since the yeare 600. no Bishop of *Rome* was euer at *Hierusalem*. XXXII.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downam* denieth that Antichrist shall sit at *Hierusalem*, and to *Bellarmines* first proofe out of *Apoc.* 11. he answereth: first, that *it may be doubted, that S. Iohn speaketh not of Antichrist*, because he seemeth to speake of *the former beast Apoc.* 13. which *M. Downam* supposeth not to be Antichrist. But this is a very good confirmation, that *S. Iohn* speaketh of Antichrist in this place also, since it is certaine, that he speaketh of him in the 13. *chapter*, and expresseth him by the former beast, and in a manner all Interpreters agree, that Antichrist is spoken of in both places, and of this latter we haue said some thing before. Secondly, *M. Downam* confirmeth this his doubt, that Antichrist is not spoken of *Apoc.* 11. because the *Papists teach, that Antichrist shall be the King of the Iewes, and counterfaite Christians, therfore by their owne Doctrine, this persecution of the Church by the Gentiles, should not be the persecution vnder Antichrist.* But the answere is easie, as *Ribera*, and others vpon this place learnedly declare, for *S. Iohn* speaketh of the Church vnder the metaphor of the Temple, and consequently calleth her enemies Gentiles, because those that impugned the Temple were such: and besides *M. Downam* cannot choose but know that the Papists thinke, that all those which follow Antichrist, though they were before Iewes, and Christians, yet then they shall be Gentiles, and Idolaters, since they shall acknowledg no other God, but Antichrist himselfe. Besides this doubt, whether *S. Iohn* speaketh in this place of Antichrist, or no, *M. Downam* saith, that he hath proued two other points more certainely: First, that *Henoch* and *Elias* be not heere spoken of; and that the holy Ghost doth not meane *Hierusalem*. But these proofs of his are all confuted in their due places, to which I remit the

V. IX. X. XI. Antichrist his Seate shall be in Ierusalē.

Apoc. 11.
Apoc. 13.
See c. 5. §. 5. *&c.*

Why those that follow Antichrist are called Gentiles.

See c. 8.

the Reader, for now I will only examine that which he bringeth in this place, where he is content to suppose, that *S. Iohn* speaketh *both of Antichrist and of Ierusalem*, and yet saith, that it *followeth not, that wheresoeuer the witnesses of Christ are put to death by him, or by his authority, that there should be his principall seate:* and then he putteth *Bellarmines* argument in forme for him, making the proposition thus, *Where the two witnesses are put to death, there is the seate of Antichrist:* to which he also answereth with this distinction, that *being generally vnderstood, it is false, if particularly, then Bellarmines argument is not a Syllogisme, but a Paralogisme*, where you see how he tosseth and turneth *Bellarmines* argument, to auoid the force of it, and yet it will not be: for first he would make vs believe, that *Bellarmine* spake of witnesses without determination of number, then hauing added the number, yet he saith, that it may be vnderstood generally, which I cannot conceaue how he meaneth, except it be that *Bellarmine* should speake of any two witnesses whatsoeuer, which notwithstanding is very ridiculous, since it is manifest that he speaketh of those two only, which *S. Iohn* speaketh of. But, saith M. *Downam*, if it be vnderstood particularly of two determinate and particuler witnesses, then *Bellarmines* argument is a Paralogisme. And why so I pray you Syr? What deceipt is there here? Yea, were it not great deceipt to speake vniuersally, since the Scripture speaketh determinately, and particularly of only two, which *Bellarmine* hath also euidently conuinced to be *Helias* and *Enoch*? and consequently M. *Downam* cannot deny, but that it is a perfect Syllogisme and an euident demonstration, except he can find some fault in the Assumption, for which he remitteth vs to his former proofes, by which he telleth vs, that he hath made good, that the Citty which is here spoken of, is *Ciuitas Romana*, the Citty and Empire of *Rome*; which no doubt will proue a great Citty indeed, & comprehendeth *Ierusalem*, & many great Cities besides, and consquently Antichrist may very well sit in *Hierusalem*, and yet be sayd in this sense to sit in *Ciuitate Romana*, in the Citty and Empire of *Rome*, as we see that M. *Downam* auoucheth, that our Lord was crucified in this great Citty, and yet all men know that he was crucifyed at *Hierusalem*, by

M. Downams iugling.

See part. 1. c. 2. §. 17.

M. Downam foolishly contradicteth himselfe.

by which the Reader may take a ſcantling of *M. Downams* proofes till we examine them in particuler: for it is manifeſt, that they will only proue, that Antichriſts ſeate ſhall be ſome where within the *Roman* Empire, which neuer any man doubted of yet: but this is no proofe at all, that it ſhall not be in *Hieruſalem*, ſince that alſo is within *M. Downams* great Citty, and ſo I cannot ſee, but that *Bellarmine* and *M. Downam* will agree well inough in this point, ſince he granteth that it is as true, that Antichriſt ſhall ſit at *Hieruſalem*, as that our Sauiour was crucified at *Hieruſalem*, which all men know to be moſt true.

XII. 2. To the ſecond place *Apoc.* 17. *M. Downam* remitteth himſelfe to his anſwere in another place, whither I will alſo refer the Reader for the confutation. Likewiſe to *Bellarmines* proofe from his former argument, in which he proued that Antichriſt ſhall be a Iew &c. he only ſaith, *that he hath diſproued this poſition in his former Chapter*: Wherfore I muſt alſo deſire the Reader to take a view of his diſproofes, and my confutatiō in the precedent argument. Thirdly *M. Downam* obiecteth to himſelfe the authority of 4. *Fathers*, and preſently reiecteth them, becauſe their aſſertions *cannot be proued out of Scriptures*, and will needs father this his impudency vpon *Bellarmine* himſelfe: but I would willingly know who ſhall be iudge, whether the Fathers, or *M. Downam* vnderſtand the Scriptures aright? *Bellarmine* ſometimes when the Fathers are different among themſelues, may very well cleaue to thoſe that ſeeme to him to bring better proofes, for that they ſay: and likewiſe when they affirme a thing as probable, he needeth not anouch it for certaine. Bu *M. Downam* hath none of them of his ſide, and flatly denyeth that which they affirme, without any doubt at all. And his cauils againſt the authorities in particuler, are impertinent and ridiculous, for *Lactantius* plainly ſpeaketh of the chiefeſt kingdome in Antichriſts time, which neither he, nor any other doubteth, but that it ſhall belong to Antichriſt himſelfe, and conſequently *M. Downam* is exceeding ridiculous, if not worſe, to tell vs, that *Lactantius ſpeaketh not of Antichriſt*, ſince it is manifeſt that he ſpeaketh of his Kingdome. Now as for *S. Hierome* and *Theodoret*, they affirme both the one and

See part. 2. *cap.* 2. §. 18.

XIII. *M. Downam reieceth the Fathers.*

M. Downams folly.

the other, *viz.* that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple at *Ierusalem*, and in the Churches of Christ as *Bellarmine* proueth, and sheweth that there is no opposition at all betwixt those two assertions, whatsoeuer *M. Downam* sayth to the contrary, but bringeth no proofes at all for that he saith: so that he should seeme to thinke his credit very good, and that he shall be beleiued vpon his bare word, in which he is mightily deceaued. Lastly, in this place I must desire the Reader to note *M. Downams* subtilty: for to discredit the Fathers which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth, he telleth vs that they are foure, and yet to make some shew of an answere to them, he confoundeth the sitting of Antichrist as in his Kingdome, and his sitting in the Temple of God, wherof *Bellarmin* speaketh in his next proofe, and for which he alleageth not only foure Fathers, but almost foureteene, for if you add *Lactantius* and *S. Hierome* whome he bringeth heere, they are in all thirteene.

M. Downams iugling.

XIV. 3. In the third place 2. *Thess.* 2. *M. Downam* first en-
2. *Thess.* 2. deauoreth to apply the three former expositions to the Pope, whome he affirmeth *only to sit as it were a God in the minds of men, prescribing lawes to binde the Conscience, and that with guilt of mortall sinne, as we speake.* But in this, he is at least deceaued, for we affirme that not only the Pope, but all other both spirituall and temporall Superiours may prescribe lawes to bind the conscience, and that with guilt of mortall sinne, and this we may gather euidently out of the Scripture: and many of *M. Downams* brethren are ashamed to deny it, and by all probability he would be at least afraid to affirme the contrary, if he were well examined by the temporall Maiestrate. Secondly, sayth *M. Downam, the Pope and Church of Rome vaunt that they alone are the Catholike Church, and that all others professing the name of Christ, which are not subiect to the Pope, or acknowledge not themselues members of the Church of Rome, are heretikes or schismatikes.* This is very true indeed, for we thinke that there is but one faith, and one Church, and whatsoeuer Christians are out of it, must needes be schismatikes at least, if not heretikes, and I would haue thought that *M. Downam* would not haue beene so absurd, as to deny this common principle agreed of by all, which if he had graunted, he would

Both spirituall & temporal Superiours may prescribe lawes to binde the conscience vnder mortall sinne.

One faith and one Church.

would not much haue meruailed, that we ſhould our ſelues to be of the true Church, and conſequently that all, that are not vnited to vs, are out of the Church, for we do no more then all other Churches and Congregations do. And finally *M. Downam* muſt of force put ſome limits to his Church alſo, which if he make ſo capable, that it may comprehend vs alſo, we ſhall in ſome ſort be beholding vnto him, though we cannot requite him with the like. But when we know all the conditions that are required to be of his Church, it will be an eaſy matter to inferre, that whoſoeuer wanteth thoſe conditions muſt of force be out of it, and ſo this expoſition will agree aſwell to *M. Downams* Church, and any other, as to the *Roman*. How the third expoſition may be applied to the Pope, *M. Downam* explicateth not, but only affirmeth that this is the *moſt true expoſition, and agreeth properly to the Pope of Rome*. Of the truth we ſhall ſee in due place, but how properly it agreeth to the Pope, is not ſo eaſy to conceaue. For firſt all the Churches of thoſe which *M. Downam* taketh to be the only true, or at leaſt the beſt Chriſtians, acknowledg not the Pope at all, and Catholikes acknowledg him only to be Chriſts Vicegerent vpon earth, which is far from that which Antichriſt ſhall do, when he ſhall ſo ſit in the Temple of God, that he ſhall ſhew himſelfe, as if he were God himſelfe.

Concerning the fourth opinion which pleaſeth not *M. Downam*, firſt he denieth it to be the more common opinion, as *Bellarmine* affirmed it was, and yet wheras *Bellarmin* bringeth an eleauen Authors for his opinion, *M. Downam* bringeth but fiue for his, foure of which affirme alſo as much as *Bellarmine* doth, and are by him alleadged to that purpoſe, which *M. Downam* could not chooſe but ſee, and therfore thought good to add, that *the being more common doth not proue it to be the more true, for truth goeth not by voyces, neither is it to be weighed by the multitude of ſuffrages, but by weight of reaſon*. By which you may imagine what a great deale of reaſon, and wit *M. Downam* thinketh him ſelfe to haue, and how little he attributeth to the Fathers. But all this is but in his owne proud and foolith conceipt, for all but himſelfe will be eaſily perſwaded, that there was more wit and true wiſ- XV. XVI. XVII. XVIII. XIX. XX. XXI. *See Part.* 2. *cap.* 4. §. 15.

dome in the meaneſt of theſe ancient Fathers, then there is in this inſolent Miniſter, though he had many of his fellow Miniſters ioyned with him. Secondly he denieth this expoſition to be more probable becauſe *the Temple ſhall neuer be reedified*, which were his wonted figure of *petitio principij*, but that he addeth (*as hath bene shewed.*) Wherfore I will not cenſure him any further, till the Reader hath ſeene how learnedly he ſheweth it, and whether the Fathers, or he haue more reaſon and probability in this point.

Thirdly he addeth that *it were not materiall, though this expoſition were more litterall, vnles the litterall were vſuall*. And to ſhew that it is not vſuall, he obſerueth, that *in all the Epiſtles, by the Temple of God is meant the Church*, where firſt the Reader muſt marke that the word *Temple* is not vſed in any Epiſtle, but only in this place of the 2. *to the Theſſalonians*, and in the 2. *to the Corinthians*, and only in 3. Chapters of them both, in the which the faithfull, and their bodies are called the Temple of God, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is preſent, and remaineth with them. But how can this be applied to Antichriſt ſitting in the Temple of God, and ſhewing himſelfe as if he were God? Can Antichriſt dwell in the ſoules and bodies of men, as in his Temple? Or if he could, were this hidden and ſpirituall ſitting any oſtentation, or ſhewing of himſelfe as God? And yet in this place *S. Paul* affirmeth that Antichriſt ſhall do ſo, for which no doubt he muſt ſit viſibly in a viſible Temple, by which moſt properly is ſignified the *Temple of Hieruſalem*, yea when *S. Paul* wrote, and for many yeares after, only that was ſo called, as *Bellarmine* proueth, and is to be ſeene in all the foure Euangeliſts, and the Acts of the Apoſtles. Wherfore ſince this place may, yea indeed muſt litterally be vnderſtood of a materiall Temple, aſwell as many other places of the new Teſtament, it is ridiculous folly in *M. Downam* to tell vs, that in ſome few places, the word *Temple* is to be taken ſpiritually alſo, and contrariwiſe the word *Church* materially, for of this we neuer made queſtion. Yea but, ſaith *M. Downam*, to ſit in the Temple of God, as God, *is to rule, and raigne in the Church of God, as if he were a God vpon earth*. By which expoſitiō he maketh all Prelats & Magiſtrats, which rule and raigne in the Church

Temple what it ſignifieth in the new Teſtamēt.

Church of God, to sit in the Temple of God as God, in the manner that *S. Paul* saith, that Antichrist shal sit in the Tẽple of God, which is a fit interpretation for a Puritanicall Minister, who seeketh to peruert the whole order & Hierarchy of Gods Church, & by withdrawing the Christian people from the obedience of their lawfull Pastours, prepare thẽ to receaue Antichrist himselfe when he commeth, and in the meane time his forerunners the Heretikes, of which because *M. Downam* is one himselfe, no meruaile though he pleadeth so hard for himself, his fellowes, and Maister: but if he had meant to deale sincerly he should haue proued his exposition out of the Fathers, or answered the authority of those which *Bellarm.* alleadgeth for himselfe, neither of which he once attempteth, but yet remitteth vs to another place, where God willing we will examine all that he obiecteth.

Downam seemeth to haue byn a Puritan whẽ he wrote this.

See part. 2. §. 13. 14. 15.

4. *M. Downam* hauing in this sort answered to *Bellarmines* proofes out of the Scripture, returneth to his argument *ad hominem*, where first he taketh great exception at *Bellarmine* for not putting the word (*true*) in the premisses, and yet expressing it in the conclusion, which is a meere cauill, for *Bellarmine* would not add any word in the premisses, which he found not in *Melanchon*, *Caluin*, and *Illyricus*, whose opinion he alleadged. In the conclusion which was his owne, he might very well expresse that which was necessarily to be vnderstood, as *Bellarmin* explicateth out of *Caluin* himselfe, for *M. Downams* deuise, that *the Church of Christ may be taken for the company of Christians, that is of those, that professe the name of Christ*, is too ridiculous, since by this meanes he includeth all heretikes whatsoeuer, who are indeed the Synagogue of the Diuell, & so confoundeth the Church of God, and the Sinagogue of the Deuill; & wheras *S. Paul* saith, that Antichrist shall sit in the Tẽple of God, he meaneth according to *M. Downams* interpretation the temple of the Diuell. All which is so obsurd, that the authors with whom *Bellarmine* disputeth, would haue byn ashamed of so ridiculous an assertion, and therfore they sought other euasions, as we shal see forthwith; but now let vs go on with the other illation, that the Protestants are out of the true Church: for how the Temple of *Hierusalem* is by *S. Paul* called the Temple of

VI.

The Church comprehendeth not al that professe the name of Christ.

God, we ſhall ſee afterward in the diſcuſſion of *Bellarmines* anſweres to the arguments of the Proteſtants.

5. Wherfore *M. Downam* to ſaue himſelfe, and his brethren from being out of the true Church of Chriſt, is driuen to this exigent, to deny that there is any one viſible Catholike Church, but only *one inuiſible Catholike Church*, and many *particuler viſible Churches*, which is a moſt extrauagant and abſurd paradox, contrary both to Scriptures, Fathers, and Councells, as *Bellarmine* ſufficiently proueth *lib. 4. de Eccleſia militant. cap. 10.* But now I will only oppoſe to this inſolent madnes, the authority of the Creed generally receaued of all, where the Church is called *One, Holy, Catholike,* and *Apoſtolike*: and who ſeeth not, that all which belong truly to Chriſt, muſt agree in one faith, and not to be deuided by ſchiſmes and hereſies, which in *M. Downams* conceipt can only happen in particuler Churches, or at leaſt in them only be acknowledged and rooted out? So that if any particuler Church will wholy fall to either, or rather if the chiefe head and paſtour of any ſuch Church ſhal become either ſchiſmaticall or hereticall, there is not meanes left for his reduction, ſince that he is not bound to be at vnity with other particuler Churches, nor to ſubiect himſelfe to any viſible Catholike Church, or to any viſible head therof: which is as much in effect, as to ſay, that Chriſt hath left no meanes vpon earth to decide controuerſies concerning Faith, or to take away ſchiſmes & diuiſions, but that euery particuler Church, or Paſtor, yea indeed euery particuler man may freely follow his owne fancies without contradiction, or controlement of any, ſo long as he can pretend any text of Scripture (though neuer ſo much wreſted and falſly vnderſtood) for that, which he is reſolued to hould. And is it meruarle, that hereſies and ſchiſmes be ſo rife in our daies ſince theſe abſurd paradoxes are ſo currant? But what ſhould heretikes and ſchiſmatikes do, but defend ſchiſmes and diuiſions, and impugne vnity and concord, which if they would admit, they muſt of force returne to the *Catholike Church*, where it is only to be found? Since therfore the viſible Church of Chriſt is one, and by the aduerſaries confeſſion it is the Romã, it followeth manifeſtly that

There is one viſible Catholike Church.

hey

they themſelues are out of Chriſts Church, ſince that they are out of the Roman . For the other cauill which *M. Downam* maketh, that the Romã Church is a particuler Church, is not worth the anſwering, for euery child can tell him that the Roman Church is taken for all thoſe which agree in faith, and are vnited with the Biſhop of *Rome*, who is not only Biſhop of that particuler Citty, but alſo the head and Paſtor of the whole Church, which of him, her Head, is called the *Roman Church*, which cõtinueth the true Church of Chriſt, as *Bellarmine* proueth, and *Melanchon*, *Caluin*, and *Illyricus* dare not deny, howſoeuer *M. Downam* is ſo impudent in his rayling, conſorting himſelfe with a vaine Poet, whoſe meaning notwithſtanding was far better then *M. Downams* is.

The Proteſtãts are out of the Church of Chriſt.

Petrarcha

6. *M. Downam* hauing thus ſhufled vp the matter hitherto, at length commeth to explicate himſelfe more plainly, and agreeth with *Caluin*, that the Church of *Rome* vnder the Pope *may be called the Church of God, in reſpect both of ſome notes and ſignes of a viſible Church, as the adminiſtration of the Sacrament of* Baptiſme, *and the profeſſion of the Name of Chriſt*, as alſo *of ſome reliques and remainder, as it were the gleamings of the inuiſible Church*, for he doubteth not, but that, *in the corrupteſt times of Popery, the Lord hath reſerued ſome who haue not receaued the marke of the beaſt*. And for explication he compareth the Church of *Rome* to the ſtate of *Iſrael* vnder *Ieroboam* and *Achab*, becauſe they then *retained the Sacrament of Circumciſion*, and *profeſſed Iehoua to be their God, although they worshipped him Idolatrouſly. And euen vnder Achab, the Lord had reſerued 7000. who neuer bowed their knee to Baal*. In which compariſon *M. Downam* inſiſteth wholy vpon his wonted figure of *Petitio principij*, and conſequently, all that he ſaith is but meere railing. If he would haue ſaid any thing to the purpoſe, he ſhould haue ſhewed two points in that example: the firſt that the viſible Church among the Iewes was altogeather ceaſed, by that Idolatry of *Iſrael*. The ſecond, that *Iſrael* departed not from the Religion which was generally houlden before, but that the ancient Religion was by little and little changed to Idolatry, and that thoſe which came after, ſeparated themſelues from the former, and yet were the true Church. With theſe two points

VII.

Downam his petitio principij.

points *M. Downam* might haue made some comparison, betwixt the people of *Israel*, and the Church of *Rome*. But since neither of these are so, but the quite contrary, it will fall to *M. Downam* and his fellowes share to be like the people of *Israel*, since they haue left the visible Church, of which they once were, as the other did, and consequently the Church of *Rome* is like to the people of *Iuda*, and the rest which ioyned with them, since it continueth in the ancient faith generally holden throughout Christendome, before there were any Protestants in the world. Neither do we graunt, that the Protestants haue any part of Christs Church, no more then the *Israelites* had, since they haue not any iote of true faith, howsoeuer they make profession of some articles: for the reason why they hould them, is not the authority of God proposed by the Scriptures, or the Church, but only their owne fancies, because so it seemed necessary for their reputation and credit, or some other human and priuate respect, how much soeuer they pretend to be only moued by Scripture, for of this they admit no more then they please, and for the interpretation, they haue no other rule, then their owne pruate spirit, or fancy, which is far of from being any probable rule of truth, & much lesse so certaine as is necessary for the certainty of diuine and supernatural faith to be built vpon. And this is the true reason why the Church of God is but one, because there is but one rule of fayth: from which whosoeuer falleth, cannot haue any true faith at all, nor belong to the true Church of God. The other comparison which *M. Downam* vseth is much les to the purpose, for it is not the Church, but the Bishop of *Sardis* (as he himselfe saith, that it is agreed by Interpreters both new and old) who had a name, that he liued, but indeed was dead, neither was this death for want of faith, but of charity and good workes, as is manifest, and though it were otherwise, yet *M. Downam* could proue nothing by this comparison, except we would beliue his bare word, that the Church of *Rome* were in this case, which is our chiefe question, and *M. Downams* wonted figure, to take it as granted. Wherfore since he can argue no better, let vs see how he can answere.

The Protestants like to Israel & the Catholikes to Iuda.

The Protestants haue no probable rule of faith, nor any true faith at al.

In his Sermō at Lābeth pag. 2. Apoc. 3 1.

7. To

7. To *Bellarmines* first reply vpon *Caluins* deuise, that the Roman Church is not the true Church, but that there remaine in it only the ruines and reliques of a true Church, *M. Downam* granteth, that all *visible Churches may faile, and fall away*, but *not the inuisible Church of Christ*, which he calleth the *Catholike Church*, nor any *one sound Christian, that is of this inuisible Church*. In which answere he graunteth *Bellarmine* as much as he went about to proue, that the gates of hell in his opinion haue preuailed against Christs visible Church, so that in a whole thousand yeares Christ had not so much as one constant professor of his truth, and though I might easily proue, that Christ spake of his visible Church, and that it was to endure vntill the worlds end, yet now I will not trouble my Reader with so needles a digression, since the matter is so plaine and euident in it selfe, that me thinks any man which maketh accompt of Christ his passion and glory, or of his desire to saue soules, and to prouide for their conuersion and faith, should stop his eares not to heare so great a blasphemy vttered, as *M. Downam* is not ashamed to affirme: yet if any man haue any doubt, or desire to be more fully satisfied in this point, let him read *Bellarmine* him selfe *lib. 3. de Ecclesia militant. cap. 12. & 13.*

The visible Church is to endure to the end of the world.

To *Bellarmines* second reply *M. Downam* answereth, that it *proueth nothing, except he suppose that the Church of Rome is the only true Church*: But he should haue answered it in forme, & admitted only that which *Caluin* auoucheth, that the Papists hold the *ruines of the Church, and the foundations, yea the buildings themselues halfe throwne downe*, for out of this only *Bellarmine* argueth and theweth, that the Protestants can neither haue the whole & intire church, since in their opinion it is falken, nor the part which remaineth of it, since they grant it to be amõg the Papists, to which delẽma *M. Downã* answereth not a word, but only braggeth, that *the Church of Rome may fall, & yet the Catholicke Church of God may stand, yea shall stand* &c. But he forgetteth himselfe, & marketh not what his Maister *Caluin* hath graunted, that not only the Church of *Rome*, but euen the very Church of Christ is fallen, and that the Papists haue as much as is left of it, & cõsequẽtly the Protestãts can only haue some new hereticall building of their owne,

The Protestants cannot haue the Church of Christ, but only some new building of their own.

owne, though M. *Downam* be neuer so loth to acknowledge it. Neither will the example of the Church of *Iuda* vnder *Iosias* serue his turne: for that was only a reformation of manners, and a destruction of Idolatry without any departing from the ancient Church of God, in which remained the true succession of Priests, and Gods true religion, after a visible manner, no otherwise then if it should please his Maiesty to put downe heresie, and aduance Catholike Religion in his Kingdome, which were only to imbrace the true Church of Christ, and not to erect any new building as the Protestants haue done, as *Bellarmine* conuinceth.

8. M. *Downam* hauing thus impugned *Bellarmines* arguments, commeth to refute his solutions to their obiections, and wheras *Bellarmine* gaue three solutions to the first, M. *Downam* passeth two of them ouer in silence, telling vs that he hath taken thē away in another place, which how true it is the Reader shall be iudge when we come to that encounter. Now let vs see how he refuteth the second solution which *Bellarmine* giueth, that the harlot of which *S. Iohn* speaketh, is *Rome* Ethnick raigning, worshiping Idols, and persecuting Christians, and not *Rome* Christian, the contrary of which M. *Downam* neuer goeth about to proue with any new argument, as he should haue done, it being his turne now to argue, but only contenteth himselfe to answere *Bellarmines* proofe, which he doth also by halfes, for *Bellarmine* proueth his exposition euidently by the authority of *Tertullian* & *S. Hierome*, and sheweth the impudency of heretikes, that are not ashmed to alleadg those authours altogeather against their meaning, to proue that *S. Iohn* speaketh of *Rome* Christian. To all which M. *Downam* giueth him not a word, but is very well content to be thus beaten, so that it may not be spoken of: but to the other proofe, he thinketh himselfe able to say something, & therfore answereth two wayes, 1. that though *Popish Rome* had not dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, and were not drunke with the blould of the Saints and martyrs of *Iesus*, *yet we might vnderstand the Apostle thus, that, that Citty, which then had dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, and then persecuted the Saints, is called Babylon, because it was to be the seate, or sea of Antichrist.* So

I. XXII. XXVI. *See part. 2. cap. 2.* XXIII. *Apoc. 17.* XXIV. XXV. XXV.

that

that as you ſee *M. Downam* will haue *Rome* to be called *Babylon*, becauſe it was to be the ſeate or ſea of Antichriſt, which he ſuppoſeth as manifeſt, though *Bellarmine* in this third ſolution, and before alſo in one of his arguments (both which *M. Downam* paſſeth ouer in ſilence) ſheweth manifeſtly, that Antichriſt ſhall hate this *Babylon*, and not make it the ſeat of his kingdome. So that this firſt ſolution is nothing but *M. Downams* wonted figure of *Petitio principij*, not only without any proofe, as commonly he vſeth it, but againſt euident proofe, which alſo he is forced to do now and then. His ſecond ſolution is, that *theſe notes agree alſo to Popish Rome, both in reſpect of dominion, vſurped more inſolently ouer the Kings of the earth by the Pope, then by any Emperour, and in regard of moſt cruell perſecution of the Saintes of Chriſt*. To which impudent aſſertion of his, I ſee not what other anſwere can be giuen, but to refer the matter to the Readers iudgment, who will eaſily perceaue, that the Pope hath now only a ſpirituall power ouer Kings, aſwell as ouer other Chriſtians for the good of their ſoules, without exacting or vſurping any temporall dominion ouer their perſons or eſtates, as the old Roman Emperours did, to whome they were Tributary, if not altogeather ſubiect: and whatſoeuer the Pope doth in temporall affaires, it proceedeth from his ſpirituall authority, to which no doubt temporall things do ſo farre belong, as they may hinder or help the good of ſoules, and no further, as is largely explicated by *Cardinall Bellarmine*, and other Catholike Deuines. And as for *M. Downams* Saints which the Pope doth perſecute, I am content to referre the deciſion of this queſtion, whether *Chriſtian Rome* may be called *Babylon* or no, till he hath ſhewed vs an authenticall canonization of theſe his Saints, and in the meane time it ſhall be alſo as certane, that *Ethnick Rome* is meant by *Babylon*, as that thoſe bleſſed Martyrs which died in thoſe daies, were truly the Martyrs of Chriſt and glorious Saints.

The Pope hath only a ſpiritual power ouer Princes.

9. Thus much *M. Downam* thought ſufficient to reply to *Bellarmines* anſweres of their firſt argument, and comming to the ſecond, where they contend, that *Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Church of Chriſt*, becauſe *S. Paul* ſaith; that he ſhal ſit in

II. X. XVII.

the temple of God, he is content to let passe *Bellarmines* solution to the first proofe, that the Apostle vnderstood the Church of Christ by the Temple of God which was, because when the Apostle wrote, there was no other Temple of God, but the Church of Christ, since that the Temple of the Iewes was ceased to be a Temple, when the Iewish Sacrifice and Priesthood ceased. To which *Bellarmine* answered that though it had ceased to be the Iewish Temple, yet it ceased not forthwith to be the Temple of God, but belonged to the Christians so long as it remained, as he proueth out of the Scriptures. To which as I said, *M. Downam* hath not one word, for which cause I might also haue passed it ouer in silence, but that I promised a little before to shew in this place, how the Temple of *Ierusalem* is by *S. Paul* called the *Temple of God*, which as you see is no hard matter to do, since that he speaketh of it, as it was in his time, whē it was most truly the Temple of God, and besides since Antichrist shall build it againe for the Iewes, and pretend not to withdraw them from the true God, but to professe himself to come from him, at least before he discouereth himselfe further, the temple erected by him may be called the *Temple of God*, though when he shall sit in it, and shew himselfe as God, he will professe himselfe to be the true God, and so either auouch that he is the God of the Iewes, in whose Temple he shall sit, or els extoll himselfe aboue him, for so much the words of *S. Paul* do import, as we shall see afterward.

Downam omitteth Bellarmin his answere.

II. XXVIII. Concerning the place of *Daniel*, *M. Downam* hath found his tongue againe and giueth words inough, but indeed nothing but words. Well, he replieth to all *Bellarmines* answers and to the first he vrgeth our Translation, *vsque ad consummationem & finem perseuerabit desolatio*, and *S. Hierome* who saith, *vsque ad finem mundi*, and others whome he nameth not (because as it seemeth they were not worth the naming) *vsque ad consummationem, eamque practisam*, and then he alleadgeth three places of Scripture, out of which he inferreth that the word (*vntill*) *signifieth rather a perpetuity, then cessation before the time, which seemeth therby to be limited*. But first we must charge *M. Downam* with a manifest falsification of *Bellarmines* words, for

Dan. 9.

The tẽple of Hierusalem shall be built againe in the end of the world.

for he alleadgeth them in a different letter thus: *Daniel would say, that the Temple should not bee reedified vntill a little before the end of the world*: whereas *Bellarmines* words are these, *Ad illud ex Daniele respondeo, vel Danielem voluisse dicere, non esse reedificandum Templum, nisi in fine mundi*. To that of *Daniel* I answere, that either *Daniel* would say, that the Temple is not to built againe but in the end of the world: and is not this a great shame for a Doctour of Diuinity, to be taken in so grosse an absurdity, that either he must confesse that he cannot conster two words of latin, or els that he is a wilfull falsifier? Well now that we haue *Bellarmines* true words, let *M. Downam* vrge our text, and *S. Hierome*, and see if he can pick any more out of them, then that the Temple is not to be built againe before the end of the world, which *Bellarmine* affirmeth also, and only addeth, that it may be *Daniel* meant, that it was to be built in the end of the world, but not before. But against this *M. Downam* vrgeth the authoritie of others, who add the word *precisam*, by which we might coniecture that they were some Precisians, but whatsoeuer they be, if by the precise consummation, they meane the indiuisible instant, which the Philosophers call *vltimum quod non*, they shew themselues to be more precise then wise, for the Scripture is not to be interpreted so precisely, or metaphysically, but after the manner of common and ordinary speach, as when we say, such a man made not his will till his death, we meane that he made it then &c. And as for the three authorities of Scripture, it were no hard matter to find 300. for *M. Downams* three, where it is otherwise taken, but now one or two shall suffice, as *Gen.* 49. when *Iacob* foretould that the Scepter should not be taken from *Iuda*, vntill the comming of the *Messias*, the sense is plaine, that it was to be taken from them then, yea a little before also, if *M. Downam* will needes vrge that point. Likewise 2. *Reg.* 1. where *David* and those which were with him, are said to haue mourned for *Saul* and *Ionathas* &c. *vsq; ad vesperam*, vntill the euening. I hope *M. Downam* will giue vs leaue to thinke that they left mourning then, wherfore it is a fond illation of *M. Downam* to inferre a perpetuity out of that word (*vntill*) for it importeth no such matter, but only signifieth what is done till then: but

Downam corrupteth Bellarmines words.

Gen. 49.
2. *Reg.* 1.
The word *Vntill* signifieth neither continuance nor cessation, but is indifferent to both.

whether it continued at that time, or after that time, or no, must be gathered by other coniectures or proofes: As to exemplify in one of M. *Downams* authorities, there was neuer any so fooliſh yet, as to bring that place of *Matth.* 1. to proue our Bleſſed Ladies perpetuall Virginity, but *S. Hierome* and other Fathers haue byn inforced to anſwere it, and to ſhew that the word (*vntill*) ſheweth only what hath byn done, or not done vntill then, but leaueth the reſt of the time altogeather vncertaine, whether things continued in the ſame ſtate ſtill, or no.

XXVIII. To *Bellarmines* ſecond anſwere, *M. Downam* hauing corrupted his words, as the Reader may ſee (if he pleaſe) replieth firſt, that the *Primitiue Church beleiued that the Temple ſhould neuer be built againe, & held this aſſertion of the Papiſts as a Iewiſh fable*. But he bringeth not any one authority to proue this withall, and therfore we muſt needes tell him that we do not beleiue him, for if we did, we ſhould do the Fathers great iniury, which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth, to reiect their authority without any ground, and to thinke that *M. Downam* knew the beliefe of the Primitiue Church better then all they who liued ſo long before him. For the other part of his anſwere we will not contend, but that our Sauiour might meane the *Army of the Romans* by the *Abhomination of Deſolation*, but that he meant only that, *M. Downam* neither hath proued nor euer will be able to proue, and therfore *Bellarmines* ſolution is very good, that *Daniel* when he affirmeth, that the deſolation ſhall perſeuere to the conſummation and end, might very wel meane, that though the Temple were built againe in the end of the world, yet it ſhould alway be prophaned after the ouerthrow made by *Titus*, becauſe the chiefeſt prophanation and abhomination of deſolation ſhall be in Antichriſts time.

Downam belyeth the Primitiue Church againſt the teſtimony of the Fathers.

The temple of Ieruſalem ſhal alway be prophane though it be built againe.

XXVIII. At *Bellarmines* third ſolution *M. Downam* is much offended, and telleth vs, that in this place *Daniel ſpeaketh not a word of Antichriſt, nor yet of Antiochus* his *Type*. And for *Antiochus* we beleiue him; neither did *Bellarmine* euer dreame of any ſuch matter: of Antichriſt the matter is not cleare, though now it ſkilleth not, whether he did or no, for *Bellarmine* is only to ſhew that Antichriſt ſitting in the Temple of *Hieruſalem*

ſalem, is not againſt this place of *Daniel*, and not to proue out of this place that he ſhall ſit there. Wherfore let *M. Downam* begin his reply anew, and ſo he doth, arguing that it is not probable that Antichriſt being *ſo great a Monarch will ſuffer the temple which he chooſeth for his chiefe ſeate to be vnbuilt, or that he will ſit in a temple without a roofe or vnfinished*. To which it is eaſy to anſwere, that this is not probable indeed, if he may haue tyme inough, and there fall no other hinderance. But now *M. Downam* may remember, that his raigne is to endure in that greatnes, but only three yeares & a halfe, which is very little for the finiſhing of ſo ſumptuous a building, & yet we thinke he may haue the roofe vp alſo at leaſt in ſome part, in which he ſhall ſit, till he may get the reſt finiſhed, as he will hope he ſhall, but yet he ſhall be hindred either by the ſhortnes of time, or by ſome accidents, not vnlike to thoſe that fell out in *Iulians* time, though it be very likely, that God wil permit much more in Antichriſts daies without working myracles, eſpecially ſince it is certaine, that the Temple was not to be built againe vntill the end of the world, as *Daniel* foretould. Which *M. Downam* will needes haue confirmed by that place of *Luc.* 21. where our Sauiour foretelleth, that *Hieruſalem ſhould be troden vnder the foote of the Gentiles, vntill the tymes of the Gentiles be fulfilled*. Which words if they might haue that ſenſe, were a good explication of that which *Daniel* called the conſummation and end, for it is certaine that the times of the Gentiles ſhall be fulfilled, before the end of the world be fully accompliſhed.

The temple of Ieruſalem ſhall not be finiſhed by Antichriſt. *Socrat. l. 3. cap. 20. Theodoret. l. 3. c. 20. Sozom. l. 5. cap. vlt. Luc. 21.*

10. To *Bellarmines* anſwere to the Fathers, *M. Downam* replieth not a word, and yet it contained matter of no ſmal importance, but that which ouerthroweth the whole Proteſtants deuiſe. For *Bellarmine* affirmeth & proueth, that thoſe Fathers which they alleadg, are no way againſt vs, but manifeſtly againſt them, ſince they ſpeake of materiall Churches, in which Antichriſt will commaund himſelfe to be placed and worſhipped for God, and not that he ſhall ſit in the Church of Chriſt as a Biſhop, which is only the fond conceipt of *M. Downam*, and his like, without any authority either of Scriptures, or Fathers, or ſhew of reaſon. Neither muſt the reader thinke, that *M. Downam* omitted this reply becauſe

III. XXIX.

Antichriſt ſhall ſit in materiall Churches and not in the Church of Chriſt as a Biſhop.

because he maketh little accompt of the Fathers when they seeme to be on his side, for of this we shal see the contrary in that he laboureth so earnestly to make S. *Gregory* seeme to say something in his fauour. For to *Bellarmines* answere concerning his authority he replieth, *that the pride and ambition of Iohn of Constantinople, though very great and Antichristian, was not to be compared with the incredible insolency and pride of the Antichrist of Rome,* because *Iohn of Constantinople challenged not that height of authority & soueraignty which Popes since haue vsurped, not only ouer Bishops and Ecclesiasticall persons, but also ouer the Kings and Monarches of the Earth.*

IV. XXX.

The Pope hath not so much soueraignty as Iohn of Constantinople challeged. *See part. 2. cap. 1.*

VVhere (to omit that *Biblsander* made his illation against the Pope precisely, because he maketh himselfe the vniuersall Bishop, and sitteth in the Church as head of all, and consequently all other charges are from the purpose) you see the Pope charged first, with taking more soueraignty vpon him, then *Iohn of Constantinople* did, which is a loud lye by *M. Downams* leaue: for *Iohn of Constantinople* would haue bene the Vniuersall Bishop in that sense, that there should be no other properly Bishops besides himselfe, but al others should be his Vicars and Vicegerents, which was more then euer the Pope challenged or pretended. The second charge seemeth to be, that *Iohn of Constantinople* sought only a superiority ouer all Bishops, but the Pope hath vsurped the same ouer all Kings and Monarches also: But this is so ridiculous that *M. Downam* may well be ashamed therof, for what doubt can there be, but only in a flattering parasites conceipt, that he who hath superiority ouer all Bishops, must needes also haue it ouer all Christian Kings and Monarches, since that these are also subiect in spirituall causes to their particuler Bishops and Pastors. But *M. Downam* knew well inough, where he wrote this, in which respect he doubted not that it would be pleasing, and then it made no matter for the truth, though it went against his owne conscience, for he seemeth by his writing to be of the Puritanicall sect, and consequently to thinke himselfe a better man by his Ministery, then euer a King in the world; howsoeuer he is content rather to dissemble and flatter, then to put his benefice in iopardy. Now for his bragges, that he hath *shewed els where, that in some things the Pope matcheth himselfe with Christ,*

Downam seemeth to haue byn a Puritan whē he wrote this. *See part. 2. cap. 5.*

in

in somethings he aduanceth himselfe aboue him, and aboue all that is called God. I must desire the Reader to haue patience till we come to that place, and in the meane time to looke wishly vpon *M. Downams* forehead, whether it be made of brasse or no, for surely it is exceeding hard. But now I would aske *M. Downam* in good earnest, why he left out the chiefest part of *Bellarmines* answere, for this other was but to shew that the obiection proued asmuch against the Protestants as for them, which is not to solue an argument, but to make another. Wherefore *Bellarmine* answereth directly, that the sense of *S. Gregories* words is, that because Antichrist shall be most proud, and the head of all the proud, so that he will not suffer any equalls, therfore whosoeuer vsurpeth to himselfe any thing otherwise then he ought, and will exceed and surpasse others, is his forerunner: and such were the Bishops of *Constantinople*, who being in the beginning but Archbishops, first vsurped to be Patriarches, and after the title of *Vniuersall*. How chance *M. Downam* replieth not against this? nor doth so much as go about to shew, that the Pope vsurpeth any more then he ought according to his place and dignity? which is to be Christs Vicegerent in spirituall causes, as the Emperours and temporall Princes are in temporall.

Whosoeuer vsurpeth more dignity the is due to him is Antichrist his forerũner.

To the other part of *Bellarmines* answere, *M. Downam* replieth thus: *Shameles, and yet ridiculous. Doth it not follow, that if he be the Prince of priests, as they are proud, that he is the Prince of proud Priests, such as the whole Hierarchie of Rome consisteth of?* Where first I desire the Reader to consider whether *M. Downam* be not exceeding shameles, to leaue out that clause of *Bellarmines* answere which is most to the purpose, which is his proofe, that *S. Gregory* meaneth not that Priests as Priests belong to the army of Antichrist, in these words, for so he should haue put himselfe in that army. Secondly, I must craue the like iudgment of his ridiculous sophistry, for *Bellarmine* answereth to *Bibliianders* argument, who proueth that Antichrist shall be the head of Priests, because *S. Gregory* affirmeth that his army shall be Priests. That *S. Gregory* meaneth not Priests, as they are Priests, but as they are proud, and consequently it followeth not, that Antichrist

XXXI.

Downam corrupteth Bellarmines words.

Antichrist the head of all the proud.

shall be the head of Priests (if they be not proud) but of the proud (whether they be Priests or others). M. Downam replieth that he shall be the prince of proud Priests. Can there be any thing more ridiculous then this, to infer the same which his Aduersary graunteth? Yea but he addeth, *such as the whole hierarchy of Rome consisteth of.* This is the question, and this M. Downam after his wonted manner would haue granted, which if it may not be, he hath no more to say, but will put vp his pipes and make an end, as he doth heere, but yet with a crake, for otherwise he were no Minister.

Downam his petitio principij.

THE

THE FOVRTENTH CHAPTER.

Of Antichrists Doctrine.

OF Antichrists Doctrine (saith *Bellarmine*) there is very great controuersy betwixt vs and the heretikes. It is manifest out of the Scriptures, euen by the testimony of our Aduersaries, that there shall be foure heads of Antichrists Doctrine. For first, he shall deny that Iesus is Christ, and for that cause shall impugne all the ordinances of our Sauiour, as Baptisme, Confirmation &c. and shall teach that Circumcision is not yet ceased, nor the Sabaoth, and the other ceremonies of the Law. 1. *Ioan.* 2. *Who is a lyer, but he that denieth Iesus to be Christ? And this is Antichrist, who denieth the Father and the Sonne?* Afterward when he hath perswaded that our Sauiour is not the true Christ, then he will affirme, that he himselfe is the true Christ, promised in the Law, and the Prophets. *Ioan.* 5. *If any come in his owne name, him you will receaue*, viz. for the *Messias*. Thirdly he will affirme that he is God, and will be worshipped for God. 2. *Thess.* 2. *so that he sit in the Temple of God, shewing himselfe as though he were God*. Lastly he will not only say that he is God, but also that he is the only God, and he

I.

» will impugne all other Gods, that is, aſwell the true God,
» as alſo the falſe Gods, and all Idols, 2. *Theſſ.* 2. *VVho extolleth himſelfe above all that is called God, or that is worshipped as God.* And
» *Dan.* 11. *And he will not repute the God of his Fathers, nor care for any of the Gods, because he will riſe against all.*

II. » That all theſe things are in ſome ſort true, and belong
» to Antichriſt, our Aduerſaries agree with vs: But the que-
» ſtion is of the ſenſe of theſe foure heads, for the Catholikes
» vnderſtand them plainely, and as the words of Scripture
» ſound, that Antichriſt will deny the true Chriſt, make
» himſelfe Chriſt, proclaime himſefe God, & deteſt all other
» Gods and Idols. Out of which are taken foure arguments
» that the Pope is not Antichriſt: for it is manifeſt that the
» Pope denieth not Ieſus to be Chriſt, nor bringeth in Cir-
» cumciſion, or the Sabaoth, inſteed of Baptiſme, and our
» Lords day. And likewiſe it is manifeſt that the Pope doth
» not make himſelfe Chriſt nor God; and chiefly it is mani-
» feſt, that he maketh not himſelfe the only God, ſince that
» he openly worſhippeth Chriſt, and the Trinity, and in
» our aduerſaries conceipt he worſhippeth all Idolls, that is,
» Images and Saints departed.

III. » But our Aduerſaries interprete all theſe things farre
» otherwiſe, for firſt they ſay, that Antichriſt will not deny
» in word and openly, that Ieſus is Chriſt, nor Baptiſme and
» other Sacraments, but that he will deny him in worke, be-
» cauſe vnder the colour of chriſtianiſme and the Church, he
» will corrupt the doctrine of Sacraments, of Iuſtification
» &c. *Calainus lib. 4. cap. 7. §. 25. VVe gather* (ſaith he) *that the*
» *Tyranny of Antichriſt is ſuch, that it aboliſheth not the name of Chriſt, or*
» *of the Church, but rather abuſeth it vnder the colour & pretext of Chriſt,*
» *and lieth lurking vnder the title of the Church, as vnder a vizard. Mag-*
» *deburgenſes Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 4. col. 435. So that* (ſay they) *the King-*
» *dome of Antichriſt conſiſteth in doctrine which profeſſeth Chriſt, but yet*
» *he denieth his Merit and Office.* And after: *Iohn* (ſay they) *sheweth*
» *that Antichriſt ſhall deny, that Chriſt is come in fleſh; that is, that Chriſt*
» *hath entirely redeemed and ſaued vs in his fleſh, but that our good workes*
» *do alſo help vs ſomthing to ſaluation.* Secondly they ſay that An-
» tichriſt ſhall not make himſelfe Chriſt or God in word,
» but in worke, becauſe he ſhall occupy the place of Chriſt,

and

and God in the Church, making himselfe the head of all the faithfull, which belongeth only to Christ. So the *Magdeburgenses loc. cit.* *He shall shew himselfe (say they) for God, as that he is Christs vicar, and the head of the Church, and can fasten & loose the articles of Faith.*

IIII. Finally, they say that Antichrist shall not reiect Idols, yea that he shall adore them openly, which they proue out of *Daniel*, who *cap.* 11. after that he had said, that Antichrist should rise against all the Gods, addeth: *But he shall reuerence the God* Maozim *in his place, and he shall worship the God whome their Fathers knew not, with gold and siluer, and precious stones &c.* And by *Maozim* the heretikes vnderstand the ornaments of the Churches, the Masses, Images, Reliques, and other like. So *Illyricus in lib. cont. Primat.* and all the rest.

V. And that which the Apostle saith 2. *Thess.* 2. that Antichrist shall extoll himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped: they expound the Pope, who maketh himselfe the Vicar of Christ, and yet vsurpeth greater authority then Christ had. *Illyricus in catalog. testium pag.* 3. proueth this (for I haue not hitherto seene how they proue the rest) because Christ *Matth.* 24. declared, that it is nothing els to shew himselfe to be God, yea to extoll himselfe aboue God and his worship, then to come in the name of Christ: out of which it followeth, that the Pope who challengeth himselfe to be Christs Vicar, is most truly Antichrist. Likewise Christ subiected himselfe to the Scripture saying, that he did and suffered those things, which he did and suffered, that the Scripture might be fulfilled: but the Pope sayth, that he can dispence against an Apostle or Euāgelist, and make those things which seeme right to be wicked &c. This is the summe of the chiefest part of our Aduersaries doctrine of Antichrist, which is wholy grounded vpon only Scripture, falsly explicated by new glosses. In signe wherof they alleadge not so much as one Interpreter or Doctour for themselues.

VI. Wherfore let vs begin with the first, that Antichrist shall openly, and of set purpose deny Iesus to be Christ, and therfore reiect all his Sacraments, as the inuentions of a seducer; it is proued first out of that which we haue said

» *cap.* 12. For if Antichrist shall be by nation and religion a
» Iew, and receaued by the Iewes for their *Messias* (as we
» haue shewed) certainly he shall not preach our Christ, but
» shall openly impugne him, for otherwise the Iewes should
» receaue our Christ by Antichrist, which is most absurd.
VII. » Besides, since there cannot be two Christs, how can Anti-
» christ obtrude himselfe for Christ to the Iewes, vnles he
» first teach, that our Christ which went before, was not
» the true Christ?

» Secondly, that it is proued out of that 1. *Iohn* 2. *Who*
» *is a lyer, but he that denyeth Iesus to be Christ?* And this is Anti-
» christ; for all heretikes are called Antichrists, who in some
» sort deny Iesus to be Christ: Therfore Antichrist himselfe
» shall simply, and in all sorts deny Iesus to be Christ. And it
» is confirmed, because the Diuell is said to worke the mis-
« ry of iniquity by heretikes, because they hiddenly deny
» Christ: But the comming of Antichrist is called a reuelati-
» on, because he shall openly deny Christ.

VIII. » Besides, out of the Fathers, *S. Hilary l. 6. de Trinit.* saith
» that the diuell by the *Arians* endeauored to perswade men,
» that Christ was not the naturall, but the adoptiue Sonne of
» God, but that by Antichrist he wil endeauour to perswade,
» that he is not so much as the adoptiue, that he may vtterly
» extinguish the name of the true Christ. *S. Hippolyt. mart. orat.*
» *de consum. mundi*, saith, that Antichrists Character shall be
» that men shall be compelled to say: I deny Baptisme, I de-
» ny the signe of the Crosse, and the like. *S. August. lib.* 20.
» *Ciuit. Dei cap.* 8. inquireth, whether in the time of Anti-
» christs persecution it be credible that any shall be baptized?
» and at length he answereth: *Truly* (quoth he) *both the parents*
» *shall be so courageous for the baptizing of their children, and likewise those*
» *who shall then first believe in Christ, that they will ouercome the strong*
» *man, euen vnbound.* Where *S. Augustine* presupposed that Anti-
» christ will not permit them to be baptized: and yet that
» some godly parents will rather suffer any thing, then that
» their children should not be baptized.

IX. » *S. Hierome in cap.* 11. *Dan. Antichrist* (saith he) *is to rise*
» *of a meane nation, that is of the people of the Iewes, and he shal be so vile*
» *and contemptible, that Kingly honour shall not be giuen vnto him, and*

by

by ſubtilties and deceipt he ſhall come to be a Prince , and this he ſhall do, becauſe he ſhall frame himſelfe to be captaine of the League , that is, of the Law and Teſtament of God . Where *S. Hierome* teacheth that Antichriſt ſhall obtaine the Kingdome among the Iewes , becauſe he ſhall ſhew himſelfe zealous for the Iewiſh Law. *Sedulius in* 2 . *Theſſ.* 2. ſaith , that *Antichriſt ſhall reſtore all the Iewiſh Cerimonies, that he may diſſolue the Ghoſpell of Chriſt . S . Gregory l.* 11 . *ep* . 3 . *Becauſe Chriſt* (ſaith he) *ſhall compell the people to Iudaize , that he may recall the right of the outward Law , and ſubdue to himſelfe the perfidiouſneſſe of the Iewes , he will haue the Sabaoth obſerued* .

X. Finally in the time of Antichriſt by reaſon of the vehemency of his perſecution , the publicke offices and the diuine Sacrifices ſhall ceaſe, as we haue ſhewed *c.* 7. By which it is euident , that Antichriſt will not depraue the Doctrine of Chriſt vnder the name of Chriſtianiſme, as the heretikes will , but that he will moſt openly impugne the name and Sacraments of Chriſt , and bring in the Iewiſh cerimonies: which ſince the Pope doth not , it is euident that he is not Antichriſt .

XI. Now that Antichriſt will plainely , and by name cal himſelfe Chriſt , and not his Miniſter or Vicar , that is manifeſt , firſt out of thoſe words of our Lord , *Iohn* 5 . *If another come in his owne name , him you will receaue* . Where our Lord ſeemeth of purpoſe to haue added , in his owne name , foreſeeing that the *Lutherans* & *Caluiniſts* would ſay , that Antichriſt ſhall not come in his owne name , but in the name of our Chriſt , as his Vicar .

XII. Beſides , the Fathers in many places teach this: *S. Iren. lib* . 5 . *He will endeauour* (ſaith he) *to ſhew himſelfe Chriſt . S. Ambroſe in cap* . 21 . *Luc* . *He will argue out of the Scriptures* (ſaith he) *that he is Chriſt. Theodoret in* 2 . *Theſſ* . 2 . *He will name himſelfe Chriſt. S . Cyrill cateche ſ* . 15 . *He will induce* (ſaith he) *a certaine man falſly calling himſelfe Chriſt : and by this appellation deceauing the Iewes , who expect him to come* . Briefly , all the Fathers as we haue ſhewed before , do ſay , that Antichriſt ſhall be receaued of the Iewes for the *Meſſias* : Wherfore he ſhall openly and by name make ſelfe the *Meſſias* , that is Chriſt . Wherefore the Pope , who doth not this (as is knowne) is not Antichriſt . For

in

» in that he calleth himselfe the Vicar of Christ, he affirmeth
» himselfe not to be Christ, but his seruant.

XIII. » And that Antichrist shall openly name himself God,
» and will be worshipped for God, not only vsurping some
» authority of God, but the very name of God, it is proued
» first by those words of the Apostle 2. *Thess.* 2. *So that he sitteth*
» *in the Temple, shewing as though he were God.* Where *S. Paul* doth
» not only say, that Antichrist shal sit in the Temple, for we
» also sit in Temples, and yet are not Antichrists, but also he
» explicateth the manner in which he shall sit, viz. that he
» shall sit as God, to whome alone properly a Temple is ere-
» cted. And this is more plaine in the Greeke text, for it is not
» ὡς Θεός, *tamquam Deus*, but ὅτι ἐστὶ Θεός, that is, *ostendens quod sit*
» *Deus*, shewing that he is God. And so did all the ancient Fa-
» thers vnderstand this place.

XIIII. » *S. Irenæus lib. 5. Being an Apostata and Thiefe, he will be ado-*
» *red as God. S. Chrysostome in hunc locum: He will command himselfe*
» *to be adored for God, and placed in the Temple.* And *Homil. 40. in*
» *Ioan.* expounding this place: *He will professe himselfe the God of*
» *all.* And after: *He will glory that he is the greatest of Gods. S. Am-*
» *brose in 2. Thess. 2. He will affirme himselfe to be God himselfe, not the*
» *Sonne of God.* In like sort do all expound it. By which we
» vnderstand, that the Pope who acknowledgeth himselfe
» to be the Seruant of God, and not God, is not Anti-
» christ.

XV. » Finally, that Antichrist will not suffer any God, nei-
» ther true nor false, nor any Idolls, it is proued first by those
» words of *S. Paul*, 2. *Thess.* 2. *Who is extolled aboue all that is called*
» *God, or that is worshipped*; where it is to be noted, that in
» greeke, for that is worshipped, it is σέβασμα, which the
» *Magdeburgenses* will haue to signifie worship, that is, the act
» of worshipping, not that which is worshipped, that from
» thence they may proue, that the Apostle meaneth not that
» Antichrist will not adore Idols, but that he will depraue
» the worship of the true God, maymingthe Sacraments, or
» adding vnto them diuers Cerimonies. But certainely
» σέβασμα signifieth most properly not the act, but the obiect,
» that is, that which is worshipped, as the Altar, Temple,
» Idoll &c. For the worship is called σέβας, or θεοσέβεια, not

σέβασμα.

εἴδωμα, Wherfore the same S. Paul Act. 17. Διερχόμενος γὰρ καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν &c. *Prætereiens & considerans Simulachra vestra, inueni Aram* &c. passing by and considering your Idols, I found an Altar &c. Where S. *Paul* most manifestly by σεβάσματα, vnderstãdeth the things theselues which are worshipped, as the Temples, Altars, Idols &c. And *Sapient.* 15. we read: Κρείσσων γὰρ ὁ τῶν σεβασμάτων ἄνθ', ὧν αὐτὸς μὲν ἔζησε, ἐκεῖνα δ' οὐδέποτε: *Melior est homo idolis quæ ipse fecit; nam ipse vixit aliquando, illa autem numquam.* Man is better then the Idolls which he hath made: for he liued sometime, but they neuer: which place I know not whether any dare so peruert, that he wil deny by the word σεβασμάτων, the idolls or figures themselues, which are made with mens hands, to be signified, and which seeme to haue life, and yet liue not.

Wherfore all the Grecians, and *Erasmus* also himselfe (to whome all the heretikes attribute much) aswell in his translation, as in his annotations, doth teach, that σέβασμα should be translated *Numen*, Soueraignty, or diuine power and Maiesty. Secondly the words of *Daniel cap.* 11. are most manifest: *Neither will he care for any of the Gods, but will rise against all.* Vpon which place S. *Hierome* writing, sayth: that they cãnot be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, as *Porphiry* would haue the, because it is manifest that *Antiochus* adored the Gods of the *Greekes*, but they are to be vnderstood of Antichrist, who will worship no God. XVI.

Lastly, this is the consent of the ancient Fathers. S. *Irenæus lib.* 5. *He shall lay aside Idols, to perswade that he is God, but he shall extoll himselfe the only Idoll.* S. Hippolyt. Serm. de consumm. *Antichrist will not admit Idolatry.* S. Cyril catech. 15. *Antichrist will hate Idols.* S. Chrysost. vpon this place: *He is extolled aboue all that is called God, or Maiesty; for he will not lead to Idolatry.* The same teach vpon this place *Theophilact*, *Oecumenius*, *Theodoretus*, who also note very well, that the Diuell doth and will wonderfully play with the children of perdition, for in old time he perswaded, that there were many false Gods, and that diuers Idols were to be worshipped, and by that meanes gained many: But in the time of Antichrist, because he shall see, that by the Doctrine of Christ, XVII.

» Idols are cast in a manner out of the world, and the multi-
» tude of false Gods, he will also accuse Idols, and the multi-
» tudes of them, and by that meanes will decease more yet.
» By which it appeareth, that the Pope who in the opinion
» of the Catholikes acknowledgeth God the Father, the
» Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, and in the opinion of Here-
» tikes adoreth many Idols, can by no meanes be sayd to be
» Antichrist.

XVIII. » But say they, *Daniel cap. 11. affirmeth that the God Ma-*
» *ozim shall be worshipped by Antichrist with gold and siluer, and pretious*
» *stones*; it is answered first by the God *Maozim*, which is in-
» terpreted of strengths, that is most strong, Antichrist him-
» selfe may be vnderstood, for the word *venerabitur*, will wor-
» ship, is not in the hebrew *jistahaveh, adorabit*, will adore, but
» *jecabbed, glorificabit*, will glorify, as *Psal.* 90. God saith, *Eripi-*
» *am eum & glorificabo eum*, I will deliuer him, and glorifie him,
» in hebrew *ecabbedehu*: and certainely God doth not glorify
» men, by subiecting himselfe vnto them, but by exalting
» them. So therfore shall Antichrist glorify himselfe, when
» he shall cause himself to be adored of all, for which cause the
» 70. translated it δόξαν, and in this sort doth *Theodoret* ex-
» pound it: *He calleth himselfe the strong and mighty God, for this doth*
» *Maozim signify, for he did put (in this place) for himselfe. For he will erect*
» *Temples to himselfe, and will adorne them with gold, siluer, and pretious*
» *stones*. Thus *Theodoret*.

XIX. » Secondly, it may be said, which I like better, that
» Antichrist shall be a Sorcerer, and after the manner of other
» Witches, shall secretly adore the Diuell himselfe, by whose
» help he shall do wonders, and that he is called the God *Ma-*
» *ozim*: yea I do not thinke that *Maozim* is the name of a God,
» but of a certaine most fortified and secret place, in which
» shall be the chiefest treasures of Antichrist, and in which, as
» we said, he shal adore the Diuell, for it followeth in *Daniel*:
» *And he shall cause* Maozim *to be fortified with a strong God, whome he*
» *hath knowne*. And truely *Maoz.* signifieth both strength, and
» a castle. In this sort doth *Lyranus* expound it, and that we
» must necessarily say, that Antichrist is himselfe the God *Ma-*
» *ozim*, or if it be any other, that he is not to be adored by An-
» tichrist, but in a most hidden place, and secretly from the
know-

knowledge of all, the very words of *Daniel* compel vs, which otherwise should be contrary to themselues: For if he shall care for none of the Gods, how shall he openly worship Idolls?

Now the two arguments of *Illyricus* are of no importance, for in the first, he committeth three faults. First in that he affirmeth, that Christ explicateth the words of *S. Paul*; whereas rather *S. Paul* ought to explicate the words of Christ. Secondly, in that he saith, that *Matth. 24. To come in the name of Christ*, doth signify the same, as to be the Vicar of Christ: For the explication of Christ himselfe, is repugnant to this explication of *Illyricus*, for when our Lord had sayd: *Many will come in my name*, forthwith he addeth explicating, saying: *I am Christ*. Wherfore to come in the name of Christ in that place, is to vsurp to themselues the name of Christ, which in old time *Simon Magus* did, as witnesseth *S. Iren. lib. 1. cap. 20.* and in our time *David Georgius*: and at length Antichrist himselfe shall do. But the Pope euen in that he nameth himselfe the Vicar of Christ, doth make himselfe not to be Christ. XX.

Illyricus his third fault is, that he maketh Christ an vnfit interpreter of *S. Paul*, for he doth not rightly expound that place of *S. Paul* (*He extolleth himselfe aboue all Gods*) by this (*many will come in my name, that is, will make themselues my Vicars*) for the Vicar of God is not aboue all Gods, but vnder all Gods, as the Vicar of a King, is vnder all Kings, for it cannot be imagined or deuised how he, that professeth himselfe to be the Vicegerent of any King, should boast, that he is aboue all Kings, by which the blindnesse and impudency of our Aduersaries is apparent, who somtime vtter such things as are against common sense. XXI.

And to that argument of *Illyricus*, by which he proued, that the Pope did vsurpe greater authority then Christ hath; I answere, that the proposition and assumption of that argument, are two lyes, and besides, that the consequence is nothing worth. For first it is false, that Christ subiected himselfe to the Scriptures, since that it is manifest, that he is the Author of the Scriptures, and therfore aboue the Scriptures: and when we read that Christ did those XXII.

» things which he did, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled; that is, or that signifyeth not the cause, but the event, as
» S. Chrysostome and S. Augustine teach in many places vpon Ioan. for
» Christ did not dye because Isay wrote so, but Isay wrote it,
» because it was to be.

» Secondly it is also false, that the Pope euer sayd in
XXIII. » word or in deed, that he can dispense against an Euangelist
» or Apostle, for though he can dispense in the positiue pre-
» cepts of the Apostles, yet this is not against an Apostle, but
» according to an Apostle, who doubtles knew, that the A-
» postolike power, by which he ordained something in the
» Church for a time, was to be in his successors, by which
» they might moderate or change the same thinges, as should
» be expedient for the Church. But in the *Euangelicall*, that is
» the diuine percepts, no Catholike euer said, that the Pope
» could any way dispense.

XXIV. » Finally the consequence is naught, for in the *Maior*,
» or Proposition, *Illyricus* speaketh of the subiection of Christ
» vnder the Scriptures, not concerning the precepts, but con-
» cerning the Prophesies, for *Illyricus* was not ignorant that
» Christ had taken away the Sabboath, and abrogated the Ce-
» remoniall Lawes: & in the *Minor* or Assumption, he speaketh
» of precepts; and so his argument hath foure termes, and can
» conclude nothing. This shall suffice for the doctrine of An-
» tichrist in this place.

M. Dovvnams Answere confuted.

I. 1. MAISTER *Downam* beginneth his answere, telling vs, that *there are more Doctrines of Antichrist then foure*: which *Bellarmine* denieth not, and therfore this is not to the purpose. Secondly he sayth, that *these two doctrines of diuels* 1. *Tim.* 4. *of forbidding marriage, and commanding abstinence from meats belong also to Antichrist*: which *Bellarmine* will not stick to grant, or at least to let passe, as being nothing against him, or the Pope, as may easily be shewed vpon any good occasion. But now we haue other foure Doctrines in hand, of which M. *Downam* affirmeth two things. First, that *they are not all the*

doctrines

doctrines of Antichrist. Secondly, *that those which be his Doctrines, do not visibly agree to the Pope*. Wherfore let vs see how he can make either of these his assertions good, or answere *Bellarmines* proofes to the contrary.

2. First, then concerning Antichrists deniall of Christ, M. *Downam* denieth that it shall be *openly, directly, and expresly*, and telleth vs, that he hath prouided els where that Antichrist was only to deny Christ *couertly, indirectely, and by consequent*, and that he hath likewise shewed, *that the Pope doth so*. Concerning which assertions of his, I must craue thus much fauour at the Readers hands, that he will not believe *M. Downam* vpon his word, vntill after the discussion of those proofes, he find him to be an honest man, for now this place requireth that we examine how he answereth *Bellarmines* arguments. To the first of which, M. *Downam* hath nothing at all to say, if Antichrist shall be by Nation and Religion a Iew. Which point hath byn already discussed, and therfore now the reader is to giue iudgment, whether he shall be so or no, and consequently, whether it be not also manifest by this argument, that Antichrist shall deny Christ plainly and openly.

III. VI. Antichrist shall openly deny Iesus to be Christ.

See part. 2. cap. 4. §. 6. 7. 8. See cap. 12.

3. For answere to the second argument, M. *Downam* denieth, that *S. Iohn in that place speaketh either of the body of Antichrist in generall, or of the head of that body in particuler, but of Cerinthus and others, which denied the Diuinity of Christ, as appeareth plainly by that which followeth in the text: This is that Antichrist that denieth the Father & the Sonne*. But M. *Downam* might haue remebred how *Bellarmine* in his second argument obserued, that in some places the article was put in, and in some left out, to signifie when Antichrist himself was spoken of, and when his forerūners or members. Wherfore since the article is put heere, it is euident, that the chiefe Antichrist himself is spoken of. Neither is it to the purpose, that *Cerinthus* and other denied the Diuinity of Christ, for *S. Iohn* denieth not, but that others may deny it aswell as Antichrist, but only affirmeth, that he shall deny *Iesus* to be *Christ*, and likewise the Diuinity both of Christ and his Father, which others did indirectly and by consequence, as M. *Downam* confesseth, which seemeth not sufficient for that which *S. Iohn* sayth:

VII. 1. *Ioan.* 2.

for he speaketh absolutly, and affirmeth, that Antichrist shall deny aswell the Diuinity of the Father, as of Christ. And by this *M. Downam* may see how he was at least deceaued, when he affirmed, that *Bellarmine vnderstood this place of denying of Christ, couertly, indirectly, and by consequence.* Perhaps when *Bellarmine* added, that all heretikes are called Antichrists, who in some sort deny *Iesus* to be *Christ*, *M. Downam* vnderstood that they were called so in this place. But this is a great mistaking, since in this place Antichrist is with an article: by which *Bellarmine* gathereth, that Antichrist himselfe is spoken of, as before, where the Apostle saith, that many were become Antichrists, there is no article, and therfore the Apostle speaketh of heretikes. Likewise *M. Downam* is much out of the way when he inferreth, that because Antichrist shall *come in all deceauableness of iniquity*, as *S. Paul* affirmeth 2. *Thess.* 2. therfore he shall not deny Christ openly, for that seduction or deceauableness is vnderstood of his subtill and cunning perswasions, and not for any moderation in his errours and blasphemies, which the greater they shal be, the more craft he wil vse to bring men to them, and not only craft, but also all power and lying signes, and wonders, as the Apostle testifieth in the same place: and finally most grieuous persecution, as we haue seene before. Wherfore no doubt, besides the authority of *S. Iohn*, *Bellarmines* inference is very good, from the heretikes to Antichrist himselfe, for he shall exceed them in opposition to Christ by many degrees: so that since they haue denied Christ couertly, yea some of them openly also, Antichrist shall go as farre and further, then any of them, in this deniall. And though those other comparisons which *M. Downam* maketh of the *parts and points of Christian Doctrine*, and likewise in respect *of the parties* which shall ioyne with him, and finally in the greatnesse of *ambition*, be also true, if they be rightly vnderstood: for no doubt Antichrist shall surpasse all heretikes in these also, yet this is no proofe, that he shall not exceed them likewise in the greatnes of his errours & blasphemies, which is that, that *Bellarmine* now only affirmeth, without the deniall of the rest, & hath proued both out of the plaine words of *S. Iohn*, and likewise *à minori ad maius*, and thirdly confir-

§. 1.

Downam mistaketh Bellarmin

How Antichrist shall seduce.

See cap. 7.

Antichrist shall exceed al heretikes.

confirmeth it, becauſe the Diuell is ſaid to worke the myſtery of iniquity by heretikes, but the comming of Antichriſt is called a reuelation. To which *M. Downam* replieth, that *the myſtery of iniquity* 2. Theſſ. 2. 7. *is Antichriſtianiſme, or that Antichriſtian Apoſtaſie from Chriſt, mentioned verſ.* 3. But firſt *M. Downam* might remember, that *Bellarmine* in his anſwere to his third obiection againſt his ſecond principall argument, ſheweth, that the departure or Apoſtaſy mentioned *verſ.* 3, hath diuers interpretations, and therfore he ſhould not haue taken this as the only. Well we will not ſtand with him in this, ſince the expoſition is probable, as *Bellarmine* declareth in that place: but we can by no meanes grant, that the myſtery of iniquity, and this Apoſtaſy is all one, ſince that (as we haue ſhewed before) *S. Paul* himſelfe doth euidently diſtingiſh them, affirming, that the Apoſtaſy was not come in his time, but that the myſtery of iniquity did thē worke. And in like manner alſo he diſtinguiſheth the reuelation of Antichriſt, for of that he likewiſe ſayth, that it was to be afterward, wherfore I cannot ſee how *M. Downam* can affirme, that the myſtery of iniquity doth moſt truely belong to Antichriſt himſelfe, vnleſſe he would alſo graunt, that Antichriſt himſelfe was come in *S. Pauls* time, which I think he will be loth to do, becauſe it will euidently follow, that either the Pope is not Antichriſt himſelfe, or els that *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, or whoſoeuer els he will make Biſhop of *Rome* in *S. Pauls* time, was Antichriſt. Wherfore ſince Antichriſt himſelfe was not come at that time, it is alſo euident, that *S. Paul* ſignified his comming by his reuealing, becauſe the iniquity which was couered with a myſtery before his cōming, ſhall be plainely reuealed and auouched by him, which is all that *Bellarmine* needeth for the force of his argument, for now we talke not of the time, or manner of this reuelation, hauing done that ſufficiently in other places. But *M. Downam* muſt needs ſay ſomething, though it be nothing at all to the purpoſe.

See cap. 20.

See cap. 20. §. 6.

The myſtery of iniquity, & the reuelatiō of Antichriſt & the Apoſtaſy be not alone.

4. *M. Downam* will needs deuide *Bellarmines* poſition into two parts, of the former of which we haue treated hitherto: the latter is, that Antichriſt ſhall impugne all the ordinances of Chriſt, & teach that Circumciſion, the Sabbaoth

baoth, and the other cerimonies of the law are not ceased. This is *Bellarmines* assertion, and not as *M. Downam* setteth it downe, changing a word or two which may seeme to import nothing: but yet *M. Downam* had a meaning in it, as we shall see afterward. Now the latter dependeth so vpon the former part, that *Bellarmine* bringeth no particuler proofes for it, as indeed he need not, since it was but an explication of the former; & yet *M. Downam* will needs haue him proue the latter by the former, and by the first argument with which he proued the former, which is nothing but meere trifeling, and to giue himselfe an occasion to make an idle repetition of part of that, which he had said before. Wherfore omitting this, let vs see, how he answereth the Fathers.

Downam his trifling

VIII. To which first in generall he giueth this censure, that *in this question they deserue no further credit, then they conspire with the Propheties of Scripture, and agree with the euent.* Both which latter you must giue *M. Downam* liberty to interpret and declare as he thinketh good. And besides I would faine know, what questions those be, in which *M. Downam* will giue the Fathers credit, without this, or the like limitations? Well the censure presupposed, *M. Downam* is content for this time to vouchsafe euery Father his particuler answere, and first to *S. Hilary* he saith, that he calleth those heretikes, *who deny Christ to be the naturall Sonne of God*, Antichrist. And is not this a trim answere trow you? Because those heretikes are called Antichrists, that is the forerunners of Antichist, therfore *S. Hilary* saith not, that Antichrist himselfe shall deny Christ to be the adoptiue Sonne of God, as though he could not say both the one and the other. But this is *M. Downams* acumen, to find a difficulty where there is none, and not to see nor vnderstand the plaine words which lye before his eyes. For thus writeth *S. Hilary*: *Loquitur hac interim, loquitur planè per aduentus sui Prophetas & praecipuè ipse ille qui postea erit in Antichristo loquuturus, salutarem fidei confessionem his tentamentis nouis inquietas, vt primum conscientiæ nostræ, quæ ita credimus, intelligentiam filij naturalis euellat: deinde ipsũ illud quod adoptiuus erit, reliquum nomen excludat. Nam cum quibus creatura est Christus, necesse est, vt cum his Antichristus ipse sit Christus, quia & filij proprietatem creatura non habeat, & Dei se ille*

Antichrist shall deny Christ to be so much as the adopted Sonne of God.

S. Hilary.

ille filium mentiatur, & per hoc à quibus hic Dei filius iam negatur, ab his tunc Chriſtus ille credatur. He ſpeaketh theſe things in the meane time: he doubtleſſe himſelfe ſpeaketh them by the prophets and forerunners of his comming, who will hereafter ſpeake in Antichriſt, diſquieting the wholſome confeſſion of Faith with theſe new tentations, that firſt he may pull out of our conſcience the vnderſtanding of the naturall Sonne, with which we beliue ſo, and after exclude the very name of Adoptiue, which ſhall remaine. For thoſe who thinke Chriſt to be a creature, muſt needes alſo take Antichriſt to be Chriſt, becauſe a creature hath not the propriety of a ſonne, and he doth falſly affirme himſelfe to be the Sonne of God: and therfore they who deny this Sonne of God now, wil beliue him to be Chriſt then. Where we ſee, that *S. Hilary* doth not only affirme, that Antichriſt will deny, that Chriſt is ſo much as the Adopted Sonne of God, but alſo that he ſhall affirme himſelfe to be Chriſt, and the Sonne of God, and be acknowledged to be ſo by his followers. To *S. Hippolytus* he ſayth plainely, that *hu authority is counterfaite*, which is the leaſt part of *M. Downams* impudency, to reiect whome he pleaſeth without either reaſon, or any other authority then his owne: yet he is content to anſwere the place obiected by *Bellarmine*, by telling him, that *he hath reiected it himſelfe before*, which wanteth not impudency, but yet hath ſome ſubtilty mixed withall: For *Bellarmine* indeed did thinke it more probable, that the marke of Antichriſt, which is but one, ſhall be poſitiue, then priuatiue: which is not altogeather ſo much, as to reiect the opinion of *S. Hippolytus*, who thinketh that it ſhal be priuatiue, but only to thinke another more probable: But the coſening tricke conſiſteth not in this. Now there is no queſtion of the marke of Antichriſt, but only of his Doctrine, and to this end is *S. Hippolytus* alleadged now, that he ſhall inforce men to renownce their Baptiſme, & the ſigne of the Croſſe. This *Bellarmine* neuer reiected, but is fully of *S. Hippolytus* his mind, thus farre only they differ, whether Antichriſt ſhall haue any other marke beſides this, or no, for that he ſhall teach this doctrine they both agree, by which *M. Downams* vizard is pulled of. To the authority of *S. Auguſtine* *M. Dow-*

S. Hippolytus.

num answereth, that *he speaketh not of Antichrist, but of the Diuell*, but he should haue added, that he speaketh of the diuell in Antichrists tyme, as he doth most plainely, by which it is euident, that Antichrist who shall be his chiefe instrument for all wickednes, shall ioyne with him in this also, which *Bellarmine* doth not affirme, that *S. Augustine* expresly sayth, but only that he presupposeth it, which is most manifest.

S. Augustine.

IX. *S. Hierome* taketh vp more roundly telling him, that he is neither *Prophet*, nor true expositor of his Prophesy of *Daniel*, for both which he giueth vs his owne honest word, and remitteth vs also to *Polan* on *Daniel* 11. But *M. Downam* must pardon vs, if we take *S. Hierome* to be the honester man of the two, and as for *M. Polan*, we haue now no spare time to loose in perusing him, it being sufficient for *Bellarmine*, and vs also, that *S. Hierome* is cleare for vs. *Sedulius* must also be content to be tould, that *his speach is incredible*, because many of the Iewish ceremonies *cannot be obserued, but in the Temple, which shall neuer be reedified*. But the best is, that *Sedulius* hath al those of his side, against *M. Downams* reason, which thinke, that the Temple shall be reedified, with whome he may be very well content to take this repulse at *M. Downams* hands, yet he hath thus much fauour shewed him, that if he will change (all) into (many) his opinion shall be admitted, because in *M. Downams* iudgment, so it *may be verified of the Pope, and of some other heretikes*. But *Sedulius* is not a whit moued with this faire offer, but still affirmeth that Antichrist shall restore all the Iewes Ceremonies, as one that will be taken for their *Messias*, and he may confirme his assertion, by that which *M. Downam* bringeth of some heretikes who are his forerunners, and therfore participate with him in some part of his wickednes: but the Pope is his chiefest opposite, and therfore neuer admitted any the least ceremony of the Iewes, though he vseth some, which are like to the, as that which is figured, ought to be to the figure and signe therof. Lastly to *S. Gregory*, *M. Downam* affirmeth that he teacheth, that Antichrist shall *not only admit the Sabbath, but also the Lords Day*: which is indeed very probable, for it will be hard for him to make so vniuersall a change vpon the suddaine, and therfore that he may please all, he will be content to winke

Sedulius. Antichrist shall restore all the Iewish ceremonies.

S. Gregory Antichrist shall cause the Sabbath to be obserued.

at

at something. But what is this against that which *Bellarmine* affirmed? Doth not *S. Gregory* affirme, that Antichrist will haue the Sabbaoth obserued? And this is all that *Bellarmine* alleageth him for, who neuer affirmed, that Antichrist *should abolish all the ordinances of Christ*, as *M. Downam* alleadgeth his words, but only that he *should impugne them*, which may very well stand with his commanding our Lords day to be obserued, at least for a while, and at his first comming, for other respects, but not for any loue he shall beare to Christ, or any liking he will haue of his ordinances, which is also manifestly *S. Gregories* mind, for he giueth this reason, why Antichrist shall keepe *Dominicum diem, quia mori se, & resurgere simulat*: because he faigneth himselfe to dye and rise againe. But for the Sabbaoth he giueth another farre different, *viz. because he shall compell the people to Iudaize ere.*

5. To *Bellarmines* last confirmation, frō the vehemency of Antichrists persecution, which shall cause the publique Offices and the diuine Sacrifices to cease, *M. Downam* answereth with a distinction, that if he meaneth *the true publique worship of God, it hath ceased already in the Papacy, by the vehemency of the Popes persecution*, who yet is no open enemy of Christ, where by the true worship of God, you may easily conceaue, that he meaneth that of Protestants: though he cannot shew vs, that euer it was before *Luthers* time, or name vs one, who felt this vehement persecution for that cause, well he may tell vs of some of their brethren (for all heretikes will be brethren, because they agree at least in one point, that is in impugning Gods Church) whome the Pope hath suppressed, for it is his office to suppresse them, as Antichrist shall endeauour to suppresse him, and all that adhere vnto him for Christs cause, whom he shall chiefly oppose himself vnto. Neither is the other part of *M. Downams* distinction necessary, for all false worshippers shall ioyne themselues to Antichrist, and help him in the persecution of the others, and if *M. Downam* remembreth, in the place which *Bellarmin* alleadged, he shewed, that Antichrist shall make *the daily sacrifice* of the Church to cease, which cannot be vnderstood of the Protestants, but of the Catholike Roman Church: but since both *Bellarmine* and *M. Downam* remit themselues to

X.

The Pope suppresseth heretikes as Antichrist shall oppresse Catholikes.

See cap. 7.

that which they haue sayd before, I will do so likewise, only I will require the Reader to note by the way, that M. *Downam* is at least mistaken in this place, if not worse, for he maketh this of the ceasing of the publike offices, and the diuine Sacrifices to be a new argument to proue, that Antichrist shall openly deny Christ, and abolish all his ordinances, whereas *Bellarmine* neuer meant any such matter, but only hauing proued by the Fathers, that Antichrist shall deny Christ, impugne Baptisme, seeke to dissolue the Ghospell of Christ, teach that the Sabbaoth and other cerimonies of the Iewes are not ceased, because he would auoyd prolixity, he remitteth himselfe to his former prooses, that he shall likewise cause the publike offices and the diuine sacrifices to cease: so that M. *Downam* might aswell haue made a new argument of euery one of the Fathers Authorities, as of this. But I will not charge him with malice in this place, except it may be attributed rather to malice then to simplicity, that he was so blind, of which I am content he shall haue his choice. But surely the one of thē he cānot auoid, as appeareth by that which I haue sayd, and also by *Bellarmines* conclusion which followeth immediatly, *Ex quibus euidens est* &c. By which it is euident &c. For that (*quibus*) cannot be referred to the last clause only, but to the whole induction out of the Fathers, as is manifest, and this is alway *Bellarmines* vse, to make the authority of the Fathers one argument.

Downam mistaketh Bellarmin

6. And thus we may come to the second doctrine, for that which M. *Downam* sayth concerning *Bellarmines* assumption, is neither to the purpose, but only so farre, as it includeth the deniall of the proposition; nor belongeth to this place, but to another, to which he remitteth himselfe, and so the Reader must haue patience till we come thither.

Downam speaketh from the purpose.

See part. 2. §. 6. 7. 8.

7. Now then concerning the second doctrine, M. *Downam* denyeth, that Antichrist will *openly, and in so many words expresly affirme, that he is the Christ or Messias of the world*, for which he remitteth himselfe to his former prooses, touching only two. 1. That *his Religion is a mystery of iniquity*, which as a little before we shewed, it is to be vnderstood of the heretikes

XI. Antichrist wil openly affirme himself to be Christ.

retikes, and cannot be applied to Antichrist himselfe. 2. *Because he could not seduce so many Christians, if he should plainely professe himselfe Christ*: But we see the contrary of this in the Turkes, who notwithstanding are nothing comparable to Antichrist, either in craft, wonders, or violence, besides the ill disposition; which he shall find in most Christians at that time. Hauing thus eased his stomake a little *M. Downam* cōmeth to answere *Bellarmines* proofe out of the Scripture, referring himselfe to his former answere, to this place in *Bellarmines* second argument, where he said, that Christ spake conditionally, if another shall come, and indefinitly of any false Prophet. But there also I shewed the contrary of both, as also, that Antichrist is to come in his owne name, and to professe so much, which other false prophets vse not to do. For as our Sauiour did not only come indeed, but also professed himselfe to come in the name of his Father: so likewise Antichrist shall not only come indeed, but also professe himselfe to come in his owne name. And if our Sauiour were to be vnderstood of all false prophets indefinitely, his speach were not true (which me thinkes *M. Downā* should be afraid to affirme) for it is euident by experience, that many false prophets haue come since that time, few or none of which the Iewes, or the greatest part of them haue receaued, wheras by his interpretation, they should haue receaued them all, and aboue all the Pope, whome *M. Downam* will needs haue to be Antichrist himselfe, whom notwithstanding they are so farre from receauing, that they hate him aboue all other men, and accompt him their greatest enemy, as we haue seene, and experience teacheth.

The Turks inferiour to Antichrist

Ioan. 5.

See cap. 2.

Our Sauiours words not true in M. Downam his opiniō

XII.

To the Fathers in this place, he vouchsafeth no answere at all, but reiecteth them absolutly, because *they were no prophets*, and spake *without booke*. This is the impudency of this fellow, that al they must of force speake without-book, that interpret Scripture against his fond fancy: But we make no doubt, but that God hath giuen the interpretation of Scripture to his Church, and the Doctors therof, which by all reason we are to acknowleadg these holy Fathers to be, since they came not without calling and commission, as *M. Downam* and his fellow Ministers, and all other heretikes

do. Neither can he help himselfe by flying to *Bellarmine* for aide, for no man reuerenceth the Fathers more then he, and it is false that he euer gaue any such rule, that *we are not to giue credit to any such coniectures of the Fathers, as haue no ground in the word of God*: For who shall be Iudge of this? How farre he admitted the opinion of those twelue Fathers who affirmed that Antichtist is to be of the Tribe of *Dan*, we shew in that place, and it was, that he tooke it to be very probable, though not altogether certaine, because the most of them tooke it not to be so; and besides they were deuided in the expositiō of those places of Scripture, some of them following the litterall sense, and some the mysticall. But here is no such diuision, all agreeing both in the exposition of Scripture, and also in the assertion it selfe.

Bellarmin reuerenceth the Fathers.

See cap. 12.

8. And thus we are to passe to the third doctrine. For that which *M. Downam* sayth concerning the assumption, is nothing but a little tast of his gift in railing against the Pope, in which he is so expert, that he cannot hould his babling, though it be nothing at all to the purpose, as in this place he himselfe confesseth that it is not, for he goeth only about to shew, that the Pope indirectly, and by consequent maketh himselfe Christ. Which if it were true, would only proue him to be an heretike, or a false prophet, but not Antichrist himselfe, of whome only we speake in this place. But how false all this impudent calumniation of our chiefe Pastour is, shall appeare in due place, to which also *M. Downam* remitteth himselfe for his proofes.

See part. 2. cap. 5.

XIII. 9. Concerning the third doctrine, *M. Downam* denieth, that *it is necessary, that Antichrist should in word, plainely and openly professe himselfe to be God*, & to the place of *S. Paul* he sayth, that the meaning is, *that Antichrist shall rule & raigne in the Church of God, as if he were a God vpon earth, shewing himselfe, not so much by words as by deeds, that he is a God*, and to maintaine this his exposition, he is content to helpe himself with the translation of the Rhemish, and of the Latin vulgar edition, who read *tamquam sit Deus* as though he were God: and likewise with the exposition of *S. Chrysostome*, *Theophilact.*, and *Oecumenius*, whose words he putteth downe, first in Greeke, and after in English thus: *He sayth shewing himselfe, he sayd not saying, but endea-*

2. *Thess.* 2.

Antichrist shall openly name himselfe God.

uouring

wouring to shew for he shall worke great works, and shall shew forth wonderfull signes. Finally, he bringeth the authority of *Beza*, who obserueth that the greeke word ἀποδεικνύντα, shewing, *is answerable to the Hebrew* Mozeh, *faciens se apparere, præ se ferens, or as we say* (saith *M. Downam*) *taking vpon him as if he were God.* All which maketh nothing at all against *Bellarmine*, but addeth this more, that he shall not only say that he is God, by which he would not be able to seduce many, but shall likewise giue great shews therof, insomuch that if it were possible, the very elect should be seduced by him. But *M. Downams* deuice is by telling vs, that he shall endeauour to shew himselfe to be God by works and wonders, to make vs beleiue, that he shall not be so shameles as to say plainly that he is God, which is a very strange conceipt, if you marke it well, for he confesseth, that by his actions he shall come to be *acknowledged, saluted, and called God*, that he shall *cause*, or at least, *suffer himselfe to be worshipped as God*, and finally, that he *shall challenge vnto himselfe those titles, attributes, and workes which are proper, and peculier vnto the Lord*, and yet hauing done all this *M. Downam* wil by no meanes grant, that he shall name himself God. Is not this a strange paradox? & yet *M. Downam* will defend it, though it be neuer so absurde, only for this cause, that he can make a floriſh amongst fooles, as though the Pope did all this, but that the Pope calleth himselfe God, he can by no deuice make it carry any colour. This is the cause why *Bellarmine* is constrained to stand so much vpon the name, so that he may leaue his aduersaries no starting-hole at all. And this he manifestly proueth out of the text it selfe; for *S. Paul* expresseth, that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple, not as others do, but as God, for if he would not be accompted and adored as God, he might as well sit in another place as in the Temple, but because that is his end, he choseth to sit in the temple, as in a place proper to his dignity, for as the Throne is proper to a King, so is a Temple proper to God, and this is plaine in the greeke, which hath *shewing himselfe that he is God.* Against this *M. Downam* taketh many exceptions. 1. That the Temple signifieth not *the materiall Temple at Hierusalem*, of which we haue treated before. 2. That by sitting, is not meant *the corporall gesture of sitting in* her

M. Downams strange paradox.

Why and how Antichrist shall sit in the Temple.

See cap. 13.

Apoc. 17.

that materiall Temple. But how chance he did not answere *Bellarmines* proofes to the contrary? for he shewed that all the Fathers without controuersy vnderstood it so, & the words themselues are plaine. 3. That the Temple is *not to be erected to Antichrists honour, since it is called the Temple of God.* This *Bellarmine* affirmed not, for the Temple shall be erected in the beginning, when Antichrist shall only discouer himselfe to be the *Messias*, which when he hath obtayned, then he shall affirme, that he is their God himselfe, and consequently that it belongeth to him to sit in that Temple, and to be adored as God, wherfore the Temple may very well be called the Temple of God, because it shall be erected to him, & yet afterward Antichrist may sit in it as God. And besides S. *Paul* calleth it the Temple of God, because it was so in his time. 4. That the greeke text hath not only ὅτι ἰσὶ Θεὸς, but also ὡς Θεὸς, by which he hurteth *Bellarmine* sorely, for it is manifest, that this maketh his assertion & proofs much more plaine, since that the same thing is affirmed heere, and he speaketh only of the last words, which by the latin might seeme to be ὡς Θεὸς, but is indeed ὅτι ἰσὶ Θεὸς, as *Bellarmine* affirmeth. Wherefore none of those foure deuices will serue the turne, and *Bellarmines* argument is inuincible, that Antichrist shall plainely professe himselfe to be God.

Why the Temple that Antichrist shall sit in is called the Temple of God.

XIV. Downam omitteth Bellarmines argument.

10. The authorities of the Fathers are so plaine, that *M. Downam* could not deuise what to say to them, for they expound a place of Scripture, and therfore he could not reiect them vnder pretence of want of Scripture, wherfore he thought it his best neuer to make mention of them, hoping perhaps that his reader would neuer misse them. And thus he commeth to the Assumption, which is, that the Pope acknowledgeth himselfe to be the seruant of God, and not God. To which he answereth, that *Bellarmine might as well conclude, that the Pope neuer calleth himselfe, Regem Regum terræ, ac Dominum Dominorum, the King of the Kings of the earth, and Lord of Lords, because he acknowledgeth himselfe Seruum seruorum Dei, the Seruant of Gods seruants.* As though *Bellarmine* went about to conclude any thing now, and did not only set downe his Assumption in plaine words, which containe two things. 1. That the Pope acknowledgeth himselfe to be the seruant of

of God. 2. Not God: either of which *M. Downam* should haue proued to be otherwise, if he would haue sayd any thing to the purpose, for whether the Pope may be called *Rex Regum &c.* or no, we shall see in another place, where *M. Downam* will spit out all his venome at once. Now it is sufficient, that the Pope doth not plainely professe himselfe God, as Antichrist shall do, & consequently he is not Antichrist, which is al we go about to proue now. In that other place we will also shew, how falsly and slaunderously *M. Downam* affirmeth, that the Pope taketh any authority vpon him, that belongeth to God, or that in practice, deed, or behauiour, he vseth himselfe, as if he were a God. Now also his beast of the Apocalyps commeth so out of place, that I will not stand to proue, that by him not Antichrist, but his false Prophet is described, which I haue heretofore shewed in part, and will hereafter declare more at large.

See part. 2. cap. 5. Downam speaketh from the purpose.

See cap. 15. § . 10.

XV.

12. *M. Downam* stormeth more at the fourth doctrine then at the rest, calling it *an absurd conceipt of the Papists*, and affirming that it *is not only repugnant vnto the truth, but also contradictory to their owne Doctrine*, in proofe wherof he asketh many questions: *If it be credible either that a mortall man shall affirme himselfe alone to be the true God, and none but he? or if he shall so affirme of himselfe, that Christians and Iewes, and all the world almost will acknowledg and worship him, as the only true God?* To which I answere, that it is not only credible, but also certaine. And the difficulty which *M. Downam* putteth, is none at all, for there can be no doubt made, but that a mortall man may be true God, for so our Sauiour was while he liued vpon earth, and now we see the whole Christian world perswaded of this truth, though our Sauiours conuersation vpon earth was so contrary to flesh & bloud, that it was a scādall to the Iewes, and folly in eyes of the Gentiles: wheras Antichrist will follow the humours of both, seeming glorious in the eyes of world, and wonderfull in lying, and deceiptfull signes, and myracles, and with all giue such liberty to his followers, that they will make no difficulty in beliuing any thing he sayth. 2. He obiecteth, that *the Antichristian seate is figured by the whore of Babylon, Apoc.* 17. which togeather with

Antichrist wil suffer no other God beside himselfe.

A mortall man, may be truely God.

Apoc. 17.

her followers are given to Idolatry. But *M. Downam* knoweth that *Bellarmine* denieth, that *Rome* figured by that whore, is the seate of Antichrist, and likewise, that those Idolatries are to be in Antichrists time, but are long since past, when *Rome* was Ethnike, both which he proued before, and *M. Downam* either would not or could not answere to either then and now he only affirmeth the contrary, which is no sufficient proofe. 3. *The Papists themselues expound Dan.* 11. 38. *where Antiochus Epiphanes is described as an Idolater, as properly spoken of Antichrist:* where the Printer surely committed an errour, though it be not noted amongst the faults escaped, for in *Dan.* 11. there is nothing that can be applyed to *Antiochus*, and only 32. *verses*: wherfore no doubt *M. Downam* meaneth Dan. 11. 38. where he speaketh of the God *Maozim*: but this place *Bellarmine* handleth at large a little after, wherfore I will intreat *M. Downam*, and the Reader also to stay for a further answere, till we come to examine *M. Downams* reply to *Bellarmines* answere concerning that place. 4. He asketh this question, *Do not themselues teach that Antichrist shall professe himselfe to be the Messias of the Iewes, and consequently that he is sent, and annointed of God?* To which I answere that we teach indeed, that he shall professe himselfe to be the *Messias* of the Iewes, but the consequent we teach not, for he shall come in his owne name, and not sent or annointed by God, and this he will professe also, if not in the beginning, yet at least after a while, and by this *M. Downams* next question is also answered, for since he shall professe himselfe not sent by God, he may say that there is no God besides himselfe. 5. *Or if he being but a mortall man, shall say that there is no God besides himselfe, may we not well thinke* (saith *M. Downam*) *that they will either hisse at him as a foole, or stone him to death as a blasphemer:* for answere of which I will spurre *M. Downam* another question. Are you so simple Syr, as to thinke, that Antichrist will only say, that there is no God besides himselfe, or that he will discouer himselfe so farre, till he see himselfe so applauded, that he may say what he listeth without any feare at all, of either being hissed or stoned? and for that obiection of mortality it is already answered, that it may stand with the Godhead, and besides Antichrist will make a faire shew of either raising

See cap. 12. Dan. 11.

fing another, or himself from death to life, which will take away this obiection the at leatt, if any stand vpon it at that time, so much as M. Downam doth at this. 6. *Nay, do not themselues teach, that he shall be in religion a Iew, an obseruer of the Sabbath and other Iewish Ceremonies? And do they not alleadg Hierome to proue, that Antichrist shall faigne himselfe to be the chiefe of the Couenant, and a chiefe maintainer of the Law and Testament of God?* To all which I answere, that we do so, for he shall not professe himselfe to be any other God, then the God of the Iewes, and consequently shall approue their law. 7. Lastly he poseth vs thus: *Are not his two horns like the Lambe expounded by some approued Authors among them, of the two Testaments which he shall seeme to professe?* To which I answere, that M. Downam might haue done wel, to haue named those approued authors, for commonly Catholike authors thinke not, that this beast with two horns like a lambe, is to be vnderstood of Antichrist, but of his precursor or false prophet, whom S. Irenæus calleth *Armigerū*, by whose two hornes are signified his power in perswading, and in working prodigious and strange things. If any expound them of the two testaments, they can haue no other true sense, but that he shall professe great knowledg in both, to establish the old, and impugne the new, that so he may preuaile with them the better which are loath to forsake Christ, for the authority of the Scriptures.

In Dan. 11.

In Apoc. 13.

12. Now that M. Downam hath disgorged his owne proofes, he is content to answere those of Bellarmin. And first concerning 2. Thess. 2. he leaueth his brethren the *Magdeburgians* in the plaine field, neuer so much as opening his lips in their defence, wherin he seemeth to acknowledge, that Bellarmine confuted them throughly: wherfore admitting, that the place is wel explicated, he denieth the consequence. *For (saith he) Antichrist may aduance himselfe aboue all that is called God or that is worshipped, and yet suffer vs to require them to be worshipped.* In proofe wherof he bringeth three instances. 1. *Iupiter was supposed amongst the Heathens to aduance himselfe aboue all other Gods, and yet suffered them to be worshipped as Gods.* 2. The second beast, Apoc. 13. doth the like with the Image of the former beast. 3. The Pope also *aduanceth himselfe aboue Angells Kings and Princes, who are called Gods, aboue the Saints, the Host, the Crosse and*

2. Thess. 2. Downam cānot defend the Magdeburgēses.

Apoc 13.

whatsoeuer is done in the Church of Rome.

But *M. Downam* is much mistaken in the matter: for Antichrist shall not only extoll himselfe aboue all other Gods; but oppose himselfe against them all, for so *S. Paul* sayth: *Qui aduersatur & extollitur, who is opposed and extolled.* Now how this aduancing and opposing himselfe can stand with suffering, yea requiring them to be worshipped as God, wil be very hard for *M. Downam*, or any other to explicate. Iupiter was supposed by the Gentiles to be the Father and King of the other Gods, but likewise he was supposed to loue them, as his children and seruants, and not to oppose himselfe vnto them. The other two instances are both false and foolish, for that second beast is not Antichrist, as *M. Downam* supposeth, nor yet aduanceth himself aboue the former, by which indeed Antichrist is signified, and not the renowned Empire. The Pope aduanceth not himselfe aboue the Angels, Saints, the Host, the Crosse &c. as *M. Downam* beliefth him: He is indeed the Pastour and the Bishop of Kings aswell as of others, and in that respect preferred before them by Christ himselfe. But what hindrance is this that he may not command Princes to be honored and obeied by their subiects, as he doth? Or what haue any of these comparisons to do with the odoration of God, as God, which he that is opposite and extolled aboue all them, that take that name vpon them, should suffer or require it to be giuen to others? And besides it is plaine, that this oppositi-on and aduancement of Antichrist aboue all other Gods, shall be for no other cause, but because they are called Gods, for if the cause were particuler, the quarrell would not be so general. As if it should be true of any King, that he oppoſeth and aduanceth himself aboue al that are called Kings, it were euident, that his quarrel against the were no other, then for that they were Kings, and were so called, and it were manifestly against his will, that any other King should raigne, or be acknowledged for a King but himselfe, and he would be far inough from suffering, yea requiring, that any of them should be worshipped, and further also from acknowledging, or worshipping any of them himselfe for King. Secondly *M. Downam* confirmeth this his answere by the example

Antichrist shall not extoll himself aboue all other Gods, but also oppose himself against them all.

Iupiter.

Downam belyeth the Pope.

Why Antichrist aduanceth and oppoſeth himself aboue all other Gods.

ample of *Antiochus Epiphanes, who aduanceth himselfe against euery God, yea against the God of Gods, Dan. 11. 36. and yet he was neuer so mad, as to professe himselfe the only God.* But to this the answere is ealy, that this place cannot be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, but only of Antichrist, as *S. Hierome* sheweth for this very reason, that *Antiochus* did not aduance himselfe against euery God, for he was a great Idolater himselfe. Thirdly *M. Downam* supposeth, that he hath proued *Antichristianisme* not to be *open Atheisme, but a mystery of iniquity* &c. But we proued before, that it cannot be the mystery of iniquity, & yet it shall not properly be Atheisme, since those which follow Antichrist shall take him for their God, and he himselfe, though openly he will worship no God, because he will professe himselfe to be God himselfe, yet secretly it is not vnprobable, that he will adore the Diuell as his God. Fourthly *M. Downam* argueth out of the text it selfe, which he sayth, *doth not ascribe to Antichrist so great an extolling of himselfe, as the Iesuite imagineth: first, because, he is called a man of sinne, and Sonne of perdition, and therefore we are to conceaue of such an aduancement of himselfe, as is incident to a mortall and wretched man.* But to this of the mortality, I haue answered sufficiently before, and the words of the text rather giue vs occasion to increase, then any way to diminish Antichrists sinne, since that he is called *Antonomastice ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, and, *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, *ille homo peccati* and *filius perditionis: that man of sinne, and that Sonne of perdition.* Which giueth vs iust occasion to thinke, that there shall be no sinne nor perdition possible for any man to run into, from which Antichrist shall be free, or rather because some sins be contrary one to the other, that he shall fall into the depth of them all by imbracing the greatest, when he cánot all. Secondly, by al that is called God in this place, *M. Downam* will haue vs to vnderstand *all to whome the name of God is communicated, as to Angels in Heauen, to Kings and Princes on earth,* and of *this aduancing aboue Kings* he would haue this place vnderstood, *because afterward it is said, that the Roman Empire hindered Antichrists aduancing or reuealing himselfe, and by σέβασμα*, he would haue vs to *vnderstand any thing that is worshipped as God, or wherin God is worshipped: Such in the Church of Rome* (saith he) *are the Host, the Crosse, the Saints, and their Images and reliques.* Aboue all

Antioch⁹ an Idolatour.

Antichristianisme is not Atheisme.

Antichrist shall commit the greatest sins, when he cannot all.

which (he thinketh) that *a man may aduance himselfe (as the Pope doth) and yet may acknowledg some other God besides himselfe*. But to How the Pope may be called God. answere briefly, though it be true, that Kings &c: and consequently the Pope also may be called God in some sort, yet *M. Downam* will neuer be able to proue, that God himselfe is also called God; and likewise the false Gods: wherfore *S. Paul* must needs comprehend these also vnder *all that is called God*. And *M. Downams* proofe is very weake, that, because the *Roman Empire is said to hinder Antichrists reuealing*, therfore he shall only aduance himselfe aboue it, for though it be true, that he cannot aduance himselfe till he be reuealed, yet afterward he may and shall, not only aboue the Roman Empire (for that he did at his reuealing) but aboue all that is called God, as *S. Paul* affirmeth. His interpretation of ἀλλοτριον we admit, but deny, that those things which he recounteth, are adored in the Church of *Rome* as God, or that the Pope aduanceth himselfe aboue them, neither of which he wilbe euer able to proue, as shall appeare, when he goeth about it. Lastly *M. Downam* affirmeth, that *the greatest height of pride, that is incident to any creature whatsoeuer, is not to seek to be aboue God, for that cannot be imagined, but to be as God. And indeed* (sayth he) *the height of Antichrist his pride, and aduancing of himselfe, is noted in the words following, &c. insomuch, that he shall sit in the Temple of God, as God*. In which words, *M. Downam* affirmeth the quite contrary to that, which *S. Paul* sayth, for his words are plaine, that Antichrist shall oppose and extoll himselfe aboue all that is called God. And this may very easily be imagined if we speake of one, that either beleeueth not, that there is any true God, or els if he beleeueth it, and consequently in his hart cannot extoll himselfe aboue him, yet he may desire to vsurpe the honour due to him, to himselfe, and to this end professe himselfe to be the only true God; and to this intent sit in the *Temple*, as he, to whome it ought to be erected, and so shew that he is God, which is indeed the height of Antichrists pride, since he cannot desire any more, then to be accompted and adored as if he were the only true God, which cannot be, vnlesse he be extolled aboue the true God, and the false also.

Downam belyeth the Pope & church of Rome.

How Antichrist may extol himselfe aboue God.

XVI. *Dan. 11.* 13. To the second testimony out of *Dan. 11. M. Downam*

now answereth two things: First, *that Daniel speaketh not of Antichrist*, in proofe whereof he alledgeth *Bellarmine* himselfe, who in this very booke *cap.* 21. affirmeth, that *in part of this very verse, Daniel speaketh* ad litteram, *litterally of* Antiochus, *who was a figure of Antichrist*. To which I answere, that he doth so indeed, and yet these words which he alleadgeth heere cannot be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, 29 *S. Hierome* affirmeth, and proueth against wicked *Porphyry*, with whome *M. Downam* will needs partake. And if *M. Downam* will know the reason of both, it is this: *Daniel* in the same words prophesieth both of *Antiochus*, and of Antichrist, but with this distinction, that where the words will beare it, they are litterally first to be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, and secondly of Antichrist, who in many things is rather figured, then expressly prophesied of, but when we meet with words, that can by no meanes be litterally applied to *Antiochus*, then of force we must vnderstand thē litterally also of Antichrist: of this sort there be many in this chapter of *Daniel*, and the next, amongst which, in the Fathers iudgment, these are to be numbred, as also they most euidently proue, and none but *Porphyry*, and such Infidels, or heretikes can deny: Those other words which *Bellarmine* speaketh of *cap.* 21. may be applyed to *Antiochus*, and consequently are litterally to be vnderstood of him. And this is no peculiar thing to this place of Scripture, but ordinary in all prophesies of Christ, which for the most part are still mingled with some other figure of him, to which many sentences are to be applyed *ad literam*, but not all: and the signe when they are, & when they are not to be applyed to the figure, is, when they containe somthing, which can, or cannot be verifyed but of Christ: & to giue *M. Downam* one example, he may at his leasure perusse the 71. *Psalme*, in which *Salomon*, and our Sauiour are spoken of, and all that can be applied to *Salomon*, is litterally to be vnderstood of him, but somethings cannot, as that *his Kingdome or name shall remaine, cum sole & ante luuam*, or that he should rule *a flumine, vsque ad terminos orbis terrarum*; that *all Kings shall adore him, and all Nations shall serue him: that all the Tribes of the earth should be blessed in him*, and the like, of which see *S. Augustine lib.* 17. *de Ciuit. Dei cap.* 8. *sub med.* The second part of

Whē the Scripture is litterally to be vnderstod of the figure and when of the thing figured.

Psalm. 71.

M. Down-

M. Downams answere consisteth in proving, that Antiochus was an Idolater. But of this no man doubteth, and because this is so certaine, therfore it is also out of question among all truly wise and learned men, that the words alleadged by Bellarmine, cannot be vnderstood of Antiochus, but only of Antichrist.

XVIII. 14. Wherfore M. Downam commeth to the obiection which Bellarmine made out of the next verse against himselfe, and insteed of replying vpon Bellarmines answere, M. Downam will needs answere also. Wherfore let vs see this answere of an answere. *I answere first* (sayth M. Downam) *that although either of his interpretations of the God Maozim were true* (*as neither is*) *yet the one hindreth not, and the other proueth, that he which is heere described, is an Idolater: for let the word Maozim signify what it may, yet the words following plainely conuince the party heere described of Idolatry, The God which his Fathers knew not, he shall worship with gold.* But let M. Downam apply either of Bellarmins solutions to this place, & he shal see that it proueth nothing at all. For if by this God which his Fathers knew not, be meant Antichrist himselfe, then he shal only honour, & not properly adore himselfe as God. If the Diuell be vnderstood (which is the second solution) then he shall only adore him secretly & not publikely; by which the second part of M. Downams obiection is also taken away, for though the word Maozim did signify a false God, yet in those which follow, the idolatry is not increased, but further explicated, for then by the God Maozim, and by the God which his Fathers knew not, is meant only the same false God: and the manner how he is to be worshipped, is shewed, viz. with gold &c. By which also M. Downam may see, how falsly he chargeth Bellarmine with omitting this secõd clause, for Bellarmine before alleadgeth the whole place with both clauses, and now he alleadgeth not the words of *Daniel verbatim*, but only taketh the sense, which M. Downams brethren obiected against vs, who were not so shamelesse or foolish, as M. Downam is, to affirme, that Daniel speaketh of two Gods, which Antichrist shall adore, for they knew well inough, that it is an ordinary thing in Scripture, to repeat the same thing in diuers words, especially with a little addition in the later, and

Antichrist shal honor or worship but one God.

IV. §. 13.

in

in this place they also knew, that all interpreters agreed, that only one God was spoken of, and that the Scripture could not be vnderstood otherwise without too apparent a contradiction. And finally, *M. Downam* may aswell inferre a third God out of that which followeth, as two out of this place. But *M. Downam* goeth forward and telleth vs, that *Mahuzzim* signifyeth the true God, which is most absurd, since it is certaine that *Antiochus*, of whome he vnderstandeth the place, neuer adored the true God; and *Kemnitius* and his other brethren the *Lutherans*, are farre from this sense, since they obiect this place against the Masse, which they take to be this God *Mahuzzim*, as *Bellarmine* sheweth heere, and *l. 1. de Sacrif. Misse cap. 1.* and his confirmation from the name *Iehouah*, or from other places, where God is called, Our Strength, is most absurd, for who doubteth, but that a false God, or Antichrist will take a name as glorious as he can, since he will extoll himselfe aboue all that is called God, & yet in none of those places this hebrew word is vsed, to signifie the true God. And his cauill against *Bellarmines* first answere is so ridiculous, that I am ashamed to trouble the Reader with repeating it, for first he maketh it seeme a great absurdity, that Antichrist should worship himselfe, wheras he knew that there was no absurdity in it, if to worship were taken for to glorify, as *Bellarmine* shewed it might be, against which *M. Downam* hath nothing to obiect, but only that both the vulgar latin, and *Bellarmine* himselfe, read *venerabitur*, and *colet*. But who knoweth not, that these words may signify glorifying also, especially since the originall doth fauour that sense. And this being all that he can obiect against *Bellarmines* first interpretation, yet is not he ashamed to call it *sottish* and *absurd*, by which I will leaue the Reader to judge, if *M. Downam* doth not shew himselfe to be an absurd Sot.

Maozim signifieth not the true God.

Maozim may signify Antichrist.

15. To *Bellarmines* second answere, *M. Downam* likewise answereth, that it seemeth *he hath forgotten the question which he tooke vpon him to defend*, because he admitteth, that Antichrist shall worship the diuell in secret. But *M. Downam* is deceaued, for *Bellarmine* remembreth very well, that he is to shew, that Antichrist shall extoll himselfe aboue all Gods, XIX.

and care for none of them, but rise against them all, as both S. Paul and Daniel affirme, and withall that he shall worship a strange God, as Daniel propheseieth. All which Bellarmin sheweth to be most true, because S. Paul and Daniel in the former place, are to be vnderstood of that which Antichrist shall do in publike, and Daniel in the later place speaketh of that, which he shall do in secret, and so there is no repugnance nor contradiction in these two propheties. Secondly M. Downam obiecteth, that if Maozim were taken for a strong Tower, it should rather be Mam, which is an weake an obiection as this Tower shall be strong. For who knoweth not, that the Hebrewes vse ordinarily one number for another: especially to signify the superlative or highest degree? and besides, Why may not one Tower haue many strengths or fortresses in it? And as for M. Downams friend Tremelius, who readeth Deum summarum fortitudinis, we oppose to him two, far more ancient and indifferent, & consequently of greater authority then he, who translate it præsidia & confugia, I meane Theodotion, and Symmachus.

Antichrist shal adore the Diuell secretly.

Maozim signifyeth a strong Tower.

After this impugnation of the word Maozim, M. Downam goeth on to obiect more of the text, for he sayth that those words, He shall fortify Maozim with a strange God, whom he hath knowne, are thus in the originall text, word for word. And he shall do to the munitions of Mahuzzim with a strãge God. Which we are content to let passe, though we might very well oppose S. Hieromes skill in hebrew to M. Downams, but we can in no sort admit his glosse vpon his new translation, that is, he shall commit the munitions of Mahuzzim, that is Hierusalem, & the Cities of Iewry to a strãge God. For this were to reiect all other trãslatours besids M. Downã, and not to stick to M. Downams originall text neyther: for what similitude hath (to do to) with (to commit?) or how can M. Downam make (to a strange God) and (with a strange God) all one? Is not S. Hieromes translation much more agreable, who insteed of (doing to munitions) interpreteth (causing to be fortified) and keepeth (with a strange God) as it is in the originall? giuing to vnderstand, that this place of Antichrist shalbe fortified both by nature and art. Lastly M. Downam will needes turne the cat in the pan, and make Antichrist a publike Idolatour, and a secret Atheist, which

S. Hierõs Translation defended.

which he ſaith agreeth more to *Machiauillian policy*, and fitteth better *the diſpoſition of Antichriſt*. But *M. Downam* muſt know, that Antiochus muſt far exceed *Machiauell* in wycked policy. Wherefore at the firſt he ſhall diſſemble this point, that he would be accompted the only God, till he hath gotten ſufficient ſtrength and reputation; and then he will ſatisfy his prydeful will, as ys his policy, & this indeed is Antichriſts diſpoſition, as appeareth by the Scripture, and in this place it is alſo euident, that he ſhall play the Idolatour only in ſecret, ſince that he ſhal chooſe to himſelfe only one fortified place for that purpoſe, whereas that of his extolling himſelfe aboue all Gods, and not caring for them, hath no ſuch reſtriction or limitation. Antichriſt his diſpoſition.

16. Thus *M. Downam* deſiſteth from impugning or anſwering of *Bellarmine*, and falleth to his owne explication of the text, in which I will only touch ſo much as maketh to the preſent purpoſe, omitting his railing againſt the Pope, and ſuch other impertinent ſtuffe.

Firſt then, *M. Downam* affirmeth, that *the abrogation of all the Religions of the Syrians*, is called v. 36. *the magnifying himſelfe aboue, or againſt euery God*, and *the ſame*, he ſaith, is *repeated* v. 37. in thoſe words, *nor the Gods of his Fathers he ſhall not attend*, and in thoſe, *neither will he regard any of the Gods*; And finally in thoſe alſo; *becauſe he will magnify himſelfe againſt all*. Where firſt we ſee, how bould *M. Downam* is with the Scripture againſt the interpretation of the Fathers, to limit that vniuerſall aſſertion ſo often repeated in different words, only to the Gods of the *Syrians* which notwithſtanding the Scripture expreſſeth by themſelues. Now, what may not any man make good that will be ſo impudent, as to wreſt the Scripture in this ſort? And beſides, *M. Downam* cannot ſhew vs, that *Antiochus* impugned any one God of *Syria*; for though it were true that the *Syrians* only worſhipped *Apollo* and *Diana*, yet he cannot ſhew vs, that *Antiochus* neglected the worſhip of theſe. The moſt that he can obiect, is the aſſault he gaue to the Citty of *Perſepolis*, or *Elymais*, in hope to haue obtained the treaſure left there by *Alexander* the great, which *Appianus in Ciriaco*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus in protrepitico* ſeeme to think, to haue bene dedicated to *Venus*, though the more pro- Downams bouldnes with the Scriptures. Antiochus impugned not the Gods of Syria.

bable opinion is, that it was the temple of *Diana*, but this is no proofe at all, that he impugned *Diana* for religion, or in *Syria*, for he might haue pretended to haue brought that treasure from *Persia*, where that temple was, into his owne coūtry; for certaine it is that he sought after the treasure, not esteeming to whome it did belong: wherefore we read of no such matter that he did in *Syria* it selfe, though he had *Daphne* so neere him; yea to omit the testimony of *Polybius*, which *M. Downam* mentioned §. 13. the Scripture speaketh of him still as of one that worshipped many Idolls; but destroyed none, for there is in diuers places mention of his Idolls 1. *Mach.* 1. 45. & 50. besides that abhominable Idoll which was placed in the temple vpon the Altar *v.* 57. which seemeth to be the Idoll of *Iupiter Olympius* mentioned 2. *Mach.* 6. *v.* 2. where also the Scripture speaketh of *Iupiter Hospitalis* placed in *Garizim*, and *v.* 7. there is expresse mention made of the feasts of *Bacchus*, which he caused the Iewes to celebrate, and 2. *Machab.* 4. of Sacrifices to *Hercules*. Finally there were other Idolls placed vpon the hill *Modin*, as is plaine out of 1. *Mach.* 1. *v.* 23. which place *M. Downams* great frend *Porphyry* would needes haue had to be vnderstood by *Maozim*, for which *S. Hierome* worthily laughed him to scorne, as no doubt he would haue done *M. Downam* for his new and most absurd interpretation. In which notwithstanding he proceedeth so far, that he is not afraid altogeather to corrupt and alter the text to that end, for thus he translateth the 38. *v. And as touching the God Mahuzzim*, that is the God Almighty, and there he pauseth, *in his place he will honour euen a God, whome his Fathers knew not will he honour with gold and with siluer, with precious stones, and with Iewells, and (ver.* 39.) *he shall commit the munitions of Mahuzzim*, that is of the Almighty, *vnto a strang God*; where you see altogeather a new text quite contrary to that of *S. Hierome*, for this is the pertinacy of heretikes, that when they can by no meanes interprete the text according to their fancy, they will rather alter the text it selfe, then leaue their owne opinion or interpretations. But any wise man will easily see, that *S. Hierome* was both more learned, and more indifferent, then *M. Downam*: and besides, who knoweth not, that the hebrew text may be altered by diuers poin-

Antiochus worshipped many Gods.

Downam corrupteth the text.

tings,

tings, which *M. Downam* will no doubt vſe to his owne aduantage? And yet after all this, he cannot frame his new text to his new interpretation, except he ſuppoſe that *Antiochus* was the firſt in *Syria* which euer worſhipped *Iupiter Olympius*, which wil be very hard for him to do. Neither is it to the purpoſe to tell vs, that the *Syrians* worſhiped *Apollo* and *Diana*, for this is no proofe that they worſhiped not *Iupiter*, and others alſo: as we may plainly ſee by that which hath bene ſaid that they did *Bacchus* and *Hercules &c.* And *Strabo*, whom he citeth, doth not only tell vs of the temple and wood of *Apollo*, and *Diana* in *Daphne*, but alſo in the ſame 16. booke, he maketh mention of the temple of *Minerua*, and of the wood of *Aeſculapius*, and affirmeth, that *Hercules* was greatly adored by them of *Tyrus*, and all this long after *Antiochus* his tyme. And for his confirmation out of *Dan.* 7. 25. & 8. 11. the former place is to be vnderſtood of Antichriſt, and the later ſheweth only how *Antiochus* was to ſpoile the temple of *Ieruſalem*, in which we graunt, that he was a plaine figure of Antichriſt, but denie that he is ſpoken of in this other place.

17. The application which *M. Downam* maketh of this propheſy interpreted by himſelfe, is ridiculous and without proofe, and therefore not to be anſwered in this place, but to be remitted to the ſecond part of this Treatiſe where we ſhall examine not only theſe, but alſo all other calumniations, which he layeth vpon the Pope. Now it is ſufficient, that it is plaine out of that which hath byn ſaid, that except *M. Downam* corrupteth the text, either of *Bellarmines* ſolutions taketh away all obiections out of this place of *Daniel*. *See part. 2. c. 5. &c.*

18. Wherefore now let vs ſee, what *M. Downam* anſwereth to the Fathers, to which he ſaith, that *Bellarmine flieth for want of better prooſes*; where I would willingly know, what better prooſes any man can bring after the Scripture then the Fathers, eſpecially in ſuch a matter as this whereof there can no other reaſon be yielded, but only Gods will in permitting, and mans wickednes in attempting, except we will add the Diuels malice alſo, whom euery man knoweth to be ready inough to tempt to any euill whatſoeuer: well XVII.

what answereth M. *Downam* to these Fathers? that they *either speake of the Idolls and Idolatry of the Gentils only*, or els, *if they speake of all Idolls in generall, they deserue such an Antichrist, as in this behalf is better then the Pope*. But who seeth not, that the Fathers assertion is generall, and withall M. *Downams* distinction foolish. For who can worship Idolls, but that he shal commit Idolatry, and conforme himselfe to the Gentils in that? wherfore the Fathers are contrary to M. *Downam* in both points. 1. that Antichrist shalbe an Idolater. 2. that the images of Saints are Idolls, and therfore no meruaile, though M. *Downam* is constrayned to reiect their authority with a scoffe, telling them that *they deserued a better Antichrist then the Pope*: by which he confesseth that they would not haue taken the Pope to be Antichrist, as he most impudently doth. And as for M. *Downams* opposing the Scriptures to the Fathers, it is his only refuge, accompring nothing for Scripture, but his owne fancyes and interpretations, which how fond and foolish they are, hath already sufficiently appeared.

Downam reiecteth the Fathers with a scoffe.

V. XX. XXI.

19. Lastly M. *Downam* commeth to *Bellarmines* answere to *Illyricus* his two arguments, and first he is very angry with *Bellarmine* for saying, that their doctrine is only built vpon the Scriptures falsly expounded by new glosses, in token whereof they alleadg not one interpreter or Doctor for them; *which* (he saith) *is a malicious slaunder, witnes this place which Bellarmine mentioneth 2. Thess. 2. where they proue by the consent of many of the Fathers, that by the temple vnderstood the Church of God, and that in the Church of God Antichrist was to be reuealed after the Roman Empyre, which hindred, was taken out of the way* &c. which you see is but a very poore answere, though it were all true, but now it is also altogether false: for *Bellarmine* shewed before, that those Fathers, which interprete the Temple of God, to be the Churches of Christ, do in no sort deny, that Antichrist shall also sit in the Temple of *Hierusalem*, yea the greater part do expresly affirme it: and besides by the Churches of God, they vnderstand not the Christian, and Catholike people, but the materiall Churches erected in the honour of Christ, which *Bellarmine* proued so plainely, that M. *Downam* thought it his best course to passe it ouer in silence

The Protestants doctrine built vpon new glosses of the Scripture.

See cap. 13.

lence without giuing him any answere at all, or taking any notice of any such proofe. And the second point, so far as it is different from the former, is affirmed also by vs, for we only differ from the Protestants, in that they affirme, that Antichrist is to be reuealed in the Church of God. And we also affirme, that he is not to be reuealed till after the Roman Empire be taken out of the way by the 10. Kings, which shall rule together at Antichrists comming.

Wherfore, secondly *M. Downam* acknowledgeth, that their *assertions concerning Antichrist, are grounded on the prophesies of Scriptures, expounded by the euent*: and that, *the opinion of the Fathers agree with them, where they are consonant to the Scripture, and the euent*: and that, *the assertions of the Papists are wholy grounded either vpon the vncertaine (and many times misalleadged) conjectures of the Fathers, who were no Prophets, and therefore being not able to foresee the euent, did not many times vnderstand the Prophesies* &c. And is not this all one in effect with that which *Bellarmine* affirmeth? Doth not *M. Downam* giue vs the Fathers conjectures, and expositions, and take to himselfe the Scripture expounded by the euent, which the Fathers were not able to foresee? and consequently these expositions, by the euent, must needs be since the Fathers dayes, and therfore rightly called by *Bellarmine* new Glosses, and how false they are, appeareth sufficiently by their contrariety to the expositions of the Fathers, and by the confutation of *Bellarmine*: for this deuice of *M. Downam* to make his exposition good by the euent, is no more in effect but to say, that he will first suppose as certaine out of his owne head, and without all Scripture, that the Pope is Antichrist, and then afterward he will make the Scripture say so by one deuice or other, and to all arguments against this interpretation he will answere, that the euent is cleare, and consequently the obiection nothing worth. And this indeed is the Protestants proceeding in all controuersies, by which they make their owne idle & foolish fancy the rule of Faith, and of Scripture, and Fathers, and all other proofes. After this *M. Downam* commeth more nigh to his reply for *Illyricus*, but first he disgraceth him fowly, calling him *one of the vnsoundest writers of his side*: which how his brethren the *Lutherans*, who make so great accompt of *Illyricus*,

Downam acknowledgeth the Fathers to be against him.

The Protestats proceeding in all controuersies.

Illyricus, will put vp, I neither know, nor greatly care. But I must needs tell *M. Downam*, that he doth *Bellarmine* great iniury, to charge him, that he *doth vse to cull out some straggling sentences out of some one of the vnsoundest writers*; for all men know, that *Bellarmine* flyeth none of their arguments, but many times affoardeth them some of his owne, when they want. And *M. Downam* should haue shewed vs, what author that *Bellarmine* had seene, hath any better arguments then those of *Illyricus* for this point: for his telling vs, that he hath proued it himselfe better in another place, only argueth, that *M. Downam* hath a good conceipt of himselfe, and that he hath gotten some new deuise since *Bellarmine* wrote, alwel in this, as in other things, but this is nothing against *Bellarmine*, how good soeuer his proofes be, which the Reader shall iudg, after they be examined, and perhaps find them not so good, as *M. Downam* imagineth. Now let vs examine his second charg against *Bellarmine*, in defence of *Illyricus*, which is, that *he depraueth his first reason, which is not* (sayth he) *because the Pope maketh himselfe to be the Vicar of Christ*, but this, *because he vaunting himselfe to be the Vicar of Christ, doth notwithstanding vsurpe greater authority then the Sonne of God claymed vnto himselfe, of which that which* Bellarmine *alleadgeth as a second reason, is by* Illyricus *added as a proofe*. But why then doth *Illyricus* alleadge our Sauiour to expound *S. Paul*: Which *Bellarmine* sheweth to be a threefould absurdity, and *M. Downam* answereth not a word; nor yet to *Bellarmines* censure of the blindnesse and impudency of our aduersaries, who some times vtter such things as are against common sense, by which *M. Downam* seemeth to acknowledg, that he hath his share in both. But no doubt we shall find a sound reply vpon *Bellarmines* answere to *Illyricus* his second argument, which *M. Downam* acknowledgeth to be his, and replieth by calling it an *impudent and shamelesse denyall, that Christ subiected himselfe to the law and word of God*, or, *that the Pope taketh vpon him to dispense with the Scriptures*, or, *that any Catholik writer hath sayd, that he may dispense with Diuine precepts*: both which notwithstanding, *M. Downam* saith, that he hath els where *proued by many instances, and most euident allegations*, where by (both) he seemeth only to meane the two later, and so we must take the first vpon his poore credit, which

Illyricus one of the vnsoundest Protestant writers in Downams iudgment.

Bellarmin vniustly charged.

See part. 2. c. 5.

Downam cannot defend Illyricus.

XXII. XXIII. XXIV. *Gal. 4. 4.* Christ is said to be vnder the law. *Luc. 2. 51.* to be subiect to his parents, because he obserued & obeyed both, not being bound to either.

which might perhaps haue had ſome ſway, if he had anſwered *Bellarmines* euident proofe to the contrary, or impugned his ſolution taken out of *S. Chryſoſtome*, and *S. Auguſtine*. But ſince he is altogeather ſilent in both, the Reader hath good cauſe to ſuſpect, that he is ſo impudent and ſhameleſſe, that he will affirme that, which he can neither proue nor defend. And conſequently at leaſt ſuſpend his iudgement of thoſe many inſtances and moſt euident allegations, for the other two points, which he boaſteth of till we come to that place, where they are to be examined. And now for concluſion of this whole argument and diſcourſe I will intreate the Reader to conſider his ſubſtantiall reply againſt *Bellarmines* anſwere concerning *Illyricus* his conſequence; for thus M. *Downam* writeth: *for that which he (Bellarmine) addeth of Chriſt his ſubiecting himſelfe to the Propheſyes, and not to the preceptes, as though Illyricus had ſpoken of the one in his propoſition, and of the other in the aſſumption, it is partely falſe, and partely ridiculous, and indeed not worth the anſwering.* Thus M. *Downam*, as it ſeemeth, in a great chafe at *Bellarmines* vnlearned anſwer. But good *Syr*, vouchſafe out of your high wiſdome to ſhew vs in what this anſwere is either falſe or ridiculous; for is it probable, that *Illyricus* would be ſo mad, as to affirme, that Chriſt was ſubiect to the preceptes of the law of *Moyſes*, conteyned in the Scripture, and abrogated by Chriſt as *Bellarmine* ſheweth? and conſequently when *Illyricus* in his *Maior*, or propoſition affirmeth, that Chriſt ſubiected himſelfe to the Scriptures, muſt it not needes be vnderſtood only of the Propheſies? of which notwithſtanding it is alſo falſe, as *Bellarmine* proueth, & when in his minor, or aſſumption he ſaith, that the Pope affirmeth, that he can diſpenſe againſt an Apoſtle or Euangeliſt, & make thoſe things, which are right to be wicked, is it not alſo euident, that he ſpeaketh only of precepts? Wherefore to me it ſeemeth alſo euident that *M. Downam* is ridiculous at leaſt, if not a falſe fellow to anſwere in this ſort, and that he moſt impudently called that not worth the anſwerering, which in his owne cõſcience he knew to be vnanſwerable. But yet I am cõtent that the Reader ſhall iudg how far he deſerueth this cenſure, & that he may mitigate it, if it ſeeme too ſharp & rigorous.

See part. 2. c. 5. §. 10. 11. 12.

M Downam Impudency.

THE FIFTENTH CHAPTER.

Of Antichrists Myracles.

I. OF the Myracles of Antichrist (sayth *Bellarmine*) there are three things in the Scriptures: first that he shall do many Myracles. Secondly what manner of Myracles they shall be. Thirdly, there are three examples set downe. That Antichrist shall worke myracles, the Apostle teacheth 2. *Thess.* 2. *Whose cõming is according to the operation of Sathan in signes and wonders*, and our Lord in the Ghospell Matth. 24. *They shall giue signes and great wõders so that the very elect shall be led into errour if it be possible. They shall giue* (sayth he) not, *he shall giue*, because not only Antichrist, but also his Mynisters shall worke signes. In so much that *S. Gregory* sayth *lib.* 32. *moral. cap.* 12. that the very tortures of the holy Martyrs shall then worke wonders and signes. Finally *Apoc.* 13. *And he did many signes in the sight of men:* What manner of signes they shall be, *S. Paul* explicateth 2. *Thess.* 2. saying in one word, that they shall be lying: *In all power and lying signes and wonders.*

II. Now they shalbe lying signes in respect of all causes, the finall, efficient, matter, and forme; for the end of those myracles

myracles shalbe to shew, that Antichrist is God, and the Messias, which will be a most pernicious lye. *S. Chrysostome* vpon this place teacheth, that those myracles are called lying, because they shall induce to a lye. And *S. Ambrose* also vpon this place teacheth, that the end of Antichrists myracles shalbe to proue himselfe God, as our Christ demonstrated his Diuinity with true myracles. Secondly, they are called lying signes, from the efficient: for the principall efficient cause shalbe the Father of lyes, that is the Diuell; for so the Apostle saith: *whose comming is according to the operation of Sathan*. And all the Fathers affirme, that Antichrist shall be a notable Sorcerer; yea that the Diuell from his conceptiō, or at least from his Infancy, shall dwell in Antichrist & worke signes by him. *S. Cyril cateches.* 15. hauing said, that Antichrist shalbe a Sorcerer, and furnished with Witchcrafts, Inchauntments, and euill Arts, sheweth, that his myracles are called lying, because they shall proceed from the Father of lyes. III.

Many of the shalbe also lying in respect of the matter, because they shalbe phantasticall and vayne illusions, as *S. Cyril* in the place alleaged, and *Theodoret* vpon this place do teach: for he shall seeme to rayse the dead, and heale the sicke, but they shall be the illusions of the Diuell, not true resurrections or recoueryes; for which cause *Apoc.* 13. Antichrist is said to do myracles *in the sight of Men*, that is, apparent and deluding the sight of Men, not solide and true; as *Arethas* noted vpon that place. IV.

Finally, some of them shalbe lying, in respect of the forme, although true in respect of the matter, for sometyme he shall worke true things, but which shall not exceed the strength of all nature, and therfore they shall not be true myracles formally; for they are only called true myracles which can be done by God alone, that is, which haue not naturall causes, neyther hidden nor manifest; and therfore are not only wonderfull in the sight of Men, but also in the sight of Diuells and Angells. But all Antichrists myracles shall haue naturall causes, but vnknowne to Men. V.

There are three examples of Antichrists myracles put *Apoc.* 13. one, that *he shall make fire come downe from Heauen*. The VI.

» second, *that he shall make the Image of the Beast to speake*. The
» third that he shall faigne himselfe to dye, and rise againe.
» For which miracle chiefly almost all the world shall haue
» him in admiration. Of which miracles the two former
» shalbe true in respect of the matter, not in respect of the
» forme, but the third in no manner.

VII. But it may be obiected against this, that all these Miracles cannot be attributed to Antichrist; for *S. Iohn* in that place bringeth in two beastes, one which hath 7. heades, and one of whose heads seemed to dye and to rise againe. The other lesse, who made fier to come downe from Heauen, and the Image to speake. If therefore Antichrist shalbe the former Beast, the two myracles of the fire and Image are not attributed to him. If he shalbe the latter beast, the myracle of the Resurrection cannot be attributed to him.

VIII. I answere that the former beast signifieth either the *Roman* Empire, or the multitude of the wicked, as we said before; and one, that is the chiefest of his heads, which seemed to die and rise againe is Antichrist; for Antichrist shalbe the supreme and last head of the wicked, and he is the last King who shall hold the *Roman* Empire; yet without name of *Roman* Emperour. And that this faigned myracle of the Resurrection is doubtlesse to be atributed to Antichrist, *Primasius*, *Beda*, *Haymo*, *Richardus*, *Rupertus* and *Anselmus* vpon this place doe teach; and *S. Gregory lib.* 11. *ep.* 3. which is to be noted against *Tyrannus*, who expoundeth this of a certaine Sonne of *Cosdroas*, whom he faigneth to haue beene wounded in a battaile and not killed, for no approued history reporteth any such thing of the Sonne of *Cosdroas*, neither can that agree to the Sonne of *Cosdroas* which followeth in the *Apocalyps: and the whole earth wondred after the Beast, saying, who is like the beast?*

IX. Now the latter Beast in the *Apocalyps* according to *Rupertus* signifieth the same Antichrist; for the same Antichrist is expressed by two beasts, by one in respect of his Kingly Power, and tyranny, by which he shall compel men violently; by the other, by reason of his art magick, with which he shall seduce men craftily. But according to *Richardus*, *Anselmus*, and others, the latter beast signifieth the preachers

thers of Antichriſt, who ſhall endeauour to ſhew by miracles, that Antichriſt is the true *Meſſias*, wherefore all theſe miracles ſhall either be Antichriſts, or his Miniſters. Hence it followeth that the Pope is not Antichriſt, for neuer any Pope faigned himſelfe to die and riſe againe, nor he himſelf, or any of his preachers made fyre come downe from Heauen, or the Image to ſpeake.

X. But the *Magdeburgenſes* obiect *cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. *col.* 436. that there haue ben many lying myracles wrought by them which hould with the Pope: as ſay they, *viſions of ſoules babling of Purgatory, and crauing Maſſes to be ſaid for them, and recouery from ſickneſſes which haue hapned to the worshippers of Statua's, and vowers to Saintes.*

XI. I anſwere firſt: Theſe are not the miracles, which *S. Iohn* writeth that Antichriſt ſhall doe, but to die and riſe againe, to ſend fier from Heauen, and giue the Image power to ſpeake; wherefore let them ſhew, that theſe haue ben don by the Pope or his followers. Secondly thoſe 3. kindes of miracles were vſed in the Church before that tyme, in which our aduerſaries ſay, that Antichriſt appeared, for *S. Gregory* writeth *lib.* 4. *dial. cap.* 40. that the ſoule of *Paſchaſius* a Deacon, who liued in the tyme of Pope *Symachus* about the yeare of our Lord 500. appeared to *S. German* Biſhop of *Capua*, and deſired him to praie for him, that he might be deliuered from the torments of purgatory. Certainely this miracle happened an hundred yeares before Antichriſt appeared, by the opinion of all the heretikes of this tyme. For none of them doth put the comming of Antichriſt, but after the yeare 600. and *S. Gregories* death. The ſame *S. Gregorie* telleth of other apparitions of ſoules asking Maſſes, in the ſame booke *cap.* 55.

XII. Of the miracles of healing diſeaſes for the veneration of Images, there is an example extant in *Euſebius lib.* 7. *hiſt. cap.* 14. where he reporteth that there was a braſen Statua erected to our Sauiour, by that woman which our Sauiour healed from the iſſue of bloud, and that there was wont to grow an herbe vnder that Statua, which being growne to the hemmes or skirts of the Image, and touching it, healed all kindes of diſeaſes; by which myracle it is euident that

» God would approue the worship of holy Images.

XIII. » Of the Recoueryes graunted to them who had vowed
» any thing to the Saints, there are innumerable Testimonies
» in the ancient Wryters; but that which *Theodoretus* recyteth,
» *lib. 8. ad Graecos, qui est de Martyribus*, is notable, that in his tyme
» the Temples of Martyrs were full of little Tablets, or Por-
» traicts of hands, feete, eyes, heads, and other parts of men,
» by which were signifyed the diuers gifts of healings, which
» men that had vowed, had receaued of the holy Martyrs.

M. Dovvnams Answvere confuted.

» 1. MAISTER *Downam* will not contend with *Bellarmine*,
» but that *Antichrist and his adherents shall worke many signes,*
» *and wonders*, and that they shall be *lying signes and wonders, both*
I. II. III. IV. V. *in respect of the end which is to seduce, and confirme lyes: and in respect*
of the substance, which is counterfayt: In which latter clause *M.*
Downam is a little confused, or at least not so cleere as *Bellar-*
Antichrist shall worke many signes. *mine*, who distinguisheth the substance, into matter & forme,
and sheweth how Antichrists signes shalbe lying in both.
But it is very likely, that *M. Downam* past this ouer so sleight-
ly, becausse he agreed with *Bellarmine* fully in that point:
wherfore he commeth to the efficient, and author of these
myracles, in respect of which *Bellarmine* also affirmeth, that
they are lying signes & wonders, becausse this efficient cause
shalbe the Father of lyes, according to whose power Anti-
christ was to come, who as some of the Fathers affirme was
to be a Magicia or notable Sorcerer. And heere *M. Downam* is
somwhat doubtful, saying that it seemeth *to be somwhat far fet-*
ched, vnlesse we will take the word ψεῦδος *to be masculine, as none doth.*
But what meaneth *M. Downam* by this phrase of far fetched?
How Antichrists signes are said to be lying signes. Is it not an ordinary matter, that the effect should be deno-
minated of the efficient cause? Why was Manna called the
Bread of Angells, but becausse it was giuen by the Ministry
of Angells? Wherfore we shall not need *M. Downams* mascu-
line; for *Bellarmine* goeth not about to proue that the word
lying, signifieth, that they shalbe such, by reason of the ef-
ficient cause. But that since they are to be wrought by the
Diuell

Diuell, as the Apostle affirmeth; and M. *Downam* acknowledgeth, and likewise all the Fathers agree, and not some only (as M. *Downam* alleageth *Bellarmines* words corruptly) that Antichrist shalbe a Sorcerer; it is also manifest, that they shalbe wrought by the Father of lyes, and consequently of him, as well as for other respects, be called lying. But we shall not need to stand any longer vpon this, since M. *Downam* is content to yield, because he doth not doubt, but that he can apply this note also to the Pope & Church of *Rome*; which how well he can do, it is not now tyme to examine, but in another place. *See part. 3. c. 6.*

2. The 2. Arguments which M. *Downam* frameth out of these two positions, that Antichrist shall worke signes, and that they shall be lying, were too ridiculous for *Bellarmine* to haue made; who only noteth those two points for explication of the whole matter; and that the third point, from which he draweth his argument may be the better vnderstood; for who seeth not that those things, which are cõmon both to good and bad, as myracles in generall are, can be no note only to know the bad by? For that which M. *Downam* addeth, that myracles *in these latter tymes* belong only to Antichrist, is spoken without all ground, eyther of Scripture or reason, and only affirmed by Protestants, because they can neyther worke true myracles, being the *Diuells* Ministers, nor false, because their Maister is not let loose yet, as he shalbe in Antichrists tyme, which is the reason, why no Heretikes can worke any myracles at all; but only the true Church true myracles, so long as the Diuel is boũd, because God is alway powerfull; and Antichrists false myracles in that short space, that the Diuell shalbe loosed and permitted to vse this manner of seducing, aswell as all the rest. Now to proue or disproue, that any is Antichrist because his signes are true or false, is a harder matter then M. *Downam* taketh it to be, as we shall see when we examine his obiections, against the myracles which haue bene wrought in the Catholike Church, and the Diuell will carry his matters so craftily in Antichrists tyme, that it will not be easy to descry that his myracles are any way false, as that of *Caluin*, and some other Ministers was, who were taken tardy,

Myracles in general belong both to good and bad.

Why Heretiks can worke no myracles at all.

See part. 2. c. 7.

dy by the punishment and confession of those whom they vsed in their knauery, as M. *Downam* may see of *Caluin*, if he please to turne to *Bellarmine lib. 4. de Ecclesia Militante cap. 14.* where also he shall find that miracles are not alway the signes of Antichrist.

VI. 3. Concerning the 3. miracles from which *Bellarmine* draweth his argument, M. *Downam* answereth that *the two first doe fitly agree to the Pope*, as he hath shewed elswhere, which we leaue to examine till we come to that place. The 3. saith *M. Downam belongeth not to Antichrist*, and he taketh it to be a very fond assertion, *that Antichrist shall faigne himselfe to dye, and by the help of the Diuell shall rise againe: for*, saith M. *Downam, if his death be but counterfaite, he shall not need the Diuells help to raise him*; but I haue shewed before, that if the death had not ben counterfaite, it had passed the Diuells cunning to haue raised him againe; and I hoped well that M. *Downam* had not bene so resolute, as he is, that the Diuells help is not necessary to do counterfaite myracles; by which he seemeth still to insinuate, that the Diuell may truly raise a man from death to life, but yet he saith it not plainely, and therfore I will not charge him with it, but only tell him once more that the Diuells help shalbe necessary in the contryuing of this counterfait myracle, that it may be carryed so cunningly that no man may be able to perceaue, but that he was truly dead, & truly raised againe; so that he will make the wound appeare more dangerous, then indeed it shall be. Likewise he will procure, that there shall be all signes of death, so that none shall doubt, but that he is truly dead. Thirdly he will shew his cunning in the cure of this wound, which shall seeme desperate and exceeding all naturall arte, and yet he will heale it so suddainly and so perfectly, and so secretly, that it will seeme altogeather vnpossible to be any other, then a true resurrection from death. And by this tyme M. *Downam* I hope will acknowledg what a fond man he was, to thinke this a fond assertion, and if he be so fond of himselfe, that he cannot be brought to see his owne folly, yet I nothing doubt, but the Readers will be more indifferent; wherefore let vs now see, what M. *Downam* can say against the place of Scripture which is thus expounded by the Fathers;

See part. 2. c. 7.

Downam seemeth to thinke that the Diuell can doe true miracles.

See c. 5. n. 5.

Apoc. 13.

thers; he anſwereth firſt that thoſe words are not to be vnderſtood of Antichriſt, becauſe *the former beaſt deſcribed in that Chapter, is not Antichriſt, but the Roman Empire, eſpecially vnder the perſecuting Emperours*, as, ſaith he, *hath byn shewed, euery part of that deſcription fitting the ſame*; but how well and how fitly, he hath ſhewed this, we ſhall ſee afterward, till when, we rather beliue the conſent of the ancient interpreters, then *M. Downams* new deuiſe. Secondly he affirmeth that the later beaſt ſignifieth Antichriſt, and this he affirmeth to be *in a manner confeſſed of all*, for proofe whereof he alleadgeth *Bellarmine* himſelf in the beginning of his tenth Chapter of this booke, where he affirmeth that the 3. laſt verſes of this 13. Chapter of the *Apoc.* are confeſſed by all wholy to apperteyne to Antichriſt: where you muſt marke two cunning ſhiftes of *M. Downam*, firſt in tranſlating (*omnino, wholy*) whereas *Bellarmine* could by no meanes vſe it in that ſenſe, ſince it is manifeſt euen by *M. Downams* conſent, that in thoſe words, both the Beaſtes are ſpoken of; for it is plainely ſaid, that the latter beaſt ſhall cauſe all men to haue the Character, or the name, or the number of the name of the former beaſt; which notwithſtanding *M. Downam* ſeemeth wylling inough to diſſemble in this place: for which cauſe he alleageth only the beginning of the words thus. And he ſhall make all both ſmall and great &c. which no doubt belong to the latter beaſt indeed; and this is his ſecond deuiſe. But *M. Downam* knoweth well inough, that *Bellarmine* alleadged not thoſe words to ſhew, who ſhould cauſe men to take the Character &c. but to proue, that Antichriſt was to haue a particuler name ſignified by that number, and a particuler Character ſpoken of in that place; both which euidently belong to the former beaſt, and therefore it is alſo moſt manifeſt, that *Bellarmine* affirmeth the quite contrary of that *M. Downam* would haue him ſay, viz. that not the latter, but the former beaſt is confeſſed by all to be Antichriſt, which is moſt true indeed, as he ſheweth in this chapter. Neyther is the proofe which *M. Downam* bringeth out of this chapter any better, for *Bellarmine* expreſly explicateth himſelfe, that he calleth the two latter myracles, the myracles of Antichriſt, becauſe they ſhalbe done by his Miniſters, & thoſe which

Downam tranſlateth not well.

Downam taketh Bellarmines words in a contrary ſenſe.

they do, are to be attributed to him, as is euident in the text. v. 12. *Et potestatem prioris bestiæ omnem faciebat in conspectu eius*: and he (the latter beast) did the power of the former beast in his sight: and consequently whatsoeuer he doth by the formers power, is to be attributed vnto him. And thus we see, what poore proofes *M. Downham* hath to proue, that the latter beast is Antichrist, since that he can produce no better authorityes, but only two places of *Bellarmine* misunderstood as the least, if not corrupted.

IX. Now then let vs see, how he impugneth the opinion of *Rupertus* in particuler, who affirmeth that Antichrist is figured by both these beasts, as *Bellarmine* afterward explicateth, *That cannot be*, sayth M. Downam, *vnles we may say that the former and latter are one and the same, which cannot be, since that v. 11. the latter is said to be ἄλλο θηρίον, another beast*. But to this *Rupertus* might easily answere, that two distinct beasts may signify one thing, as is manifest; though indeed their descriptions are so diuers, that it is hard to apply all the particulers of both to one man; and therfore we rather thinke with the common opinion, that by the latter is vnderstood either one, or many false Prophets of Antichrist, whom *S. Irenæus* doth giue ordinarily *armigerum*, because he, or they shall not only vse perswasions, but also force, as is manifest by the text, which needeth not to seeme hard to any that considereth how both these offices are exercised by the Protestant false Bishops in our Countrey against Catholikes: and this common exposition is much confirmed out of the 16. 19. & 20. Chapters, where this second beast is called a false Prophet, and ioyned with the former beast, & the Diuell also in doing mischiefe, and suffering eternall torments for the same.

The 2. beast Apoc. 13. signifieth Antichrist his false Prophet.

4. In *Bellarmines* answere to his owne obiection *M. Downam* taketh great hould of that he graunteth, that the former beast may signify the Roman Empyre, though he speaketh doubtfully, & ioyneth another exposition with it, which indeed is the more probable of the two, out of which he maketh many illations, but proueth none; and therfore it is sufficient in this place to deny them all, and remit the Reader for both our reasons, to the seuerall places where they are handled at large: only thus much we may note now,

that

that ſince, as we haue already proued, the 7. head which is Antichriſt, is not to come till the 6. which is the *Roman* Empyre, be wholy taken away, it is moſt manifeſt that the Pope can by no probability be the ſeauenth head, ſince that the Emperour as yet remayneth. And withall I would deſire the Reader to put all *M. Downams* arguments in forme, that he may better diſcouer his folly, and make himſelfe ſport: for how doth it follow, Antichriſt ſhalbe head of the Roman Empyre, *ergo, not of the Iewes?* Antichriſt ſhall be head of the Roman Empyre, *ergo, his chiefe Seat, or Sea ſhalbe not Ieruſalem, but Rome,* and *he ſhall not be one particuler Man?* only one of his illations is good againſt *Bellarmine*, viz. that if the beaſt ſignifieth the *Romã* Empyre, the name of the beaſt may very well be ſaid to be *Roman* or *Latin*. But this agreeth not with the number of 666. as *Bellarmine* proued, & beſides it is certaine alſo, that the name of Antichriſt himſelfe is ſignifyed by that number, and conſequently that he is ſignifyed by the former beaſt, and not the *Roman* Empyre. Neyther can *M. Downam* in any caſe admit that the ſeauenth head of this former beaſt *Apoc.* 13. is Antichriſt; ſince that he affirmeth that Antichriſt is ſignified by the latter beaſt, wherfore both *Bellarmine* and he muſt of neceſſity graunt, that this beaſt *Apoc.* 13. is different from the other, *cap.* 17. and indeed it is very euident that Antichriſt and the 7. Kings, which ſhall acknowledge him, are ſpoken of in the 13. Chapter, and in the 17. other 7. far different from theſe, as we ſhall preſently ſee.

VII. VIII *Apoc.* 13.

The Pope cannot be ſignified by the 7. head of the beaſt. *Apoc.* 13. & 17.

The 7. heads of the beaſt Apoc 13. are not the ſame with thoſe of Apoc. 17.

5. The obiections which *M. Downam* maketh againſt *Bellarmines* ſecond interpretation, proue aſwell againſt the firſt, which is his owne; for *what world wondreth after the Roman Empyre, but ſuch as are in ſome ſort ſubiect or belong to it? VVho are all thoſe Inhabitants of the earth, that do worſhip it? VVhat are all the Tongues, Kindreds, Nations which are made ſubiect vnto it?* For if this be abſolutely vnderſtood of all the wicked and reprobate, it is falſe, that they all do thus wonder, or worſhip, or are ſubiect to the *Roman* Empire; and if it be only vnderſtood of ſome, *viz.* of thoſe, which belong to the *Roman* Empyre, then the difficulty is as great, how the *Roman* Empyre is ſaid to wonder &c.

VIII. Downam impugneth himſelfe.

after it selfe: as how the multitude of the wicked may doe the same; and besides, *M. Downam* hath one difficulty more to explicate, then those which follow this second interpretation haue: for he must shew vs, how all this wondring, and worshipping, and subiection came vpon the restauration of the Empyre in the West, which he will needs haue to be the healing of the head, which was wounded as it were to death: for experience hath shewed vs the quite contrary, *viz.* that the *Roman* Empyre hath euer since gone more and more to decay, and had a farre greater part of the world subiect vnto it before, then since. Wherfore all this still conuinceth, that this beast *Apoc.* 13. is neyther the *Roman* Empyre, nor the multitude of the wicked, but Antichrist himselfe, of whom all those sayings are to be verifyed, and the 7. heads are the 7. Kings, which shall yield themselues to Antichrist, and ioyne with him in persecuting the Church. Neyther doth the beast mentioned *cap.* 17. signifie the Roman State or Empyre, or the multitude of the wicked, but the Diuell himselfe; and the 7. heades which he hath signify eyther the Kings which reigned in the 7. ages of the World, as it is commonly held by Catholikes, or else the 7. diuers gouernments of the Roman State, as *M. Downam* will needs haue it, because otherwise his whole deuise of prouing the Pope Antichrist out of this place is quite ouerthrowne. But we will shew in due place that this his exposition is nothing so probable as the other. And though it were true in this poynt, yet it cannot stand in the rest, in which he would ground his inference against the Pope.

Apoc. 13.

Apoc. 17.

6. Wherfore *M. Downams* discourse of the 3. wounds, which the *Roman* Empire receaued at the death of *Iulius Cesar, by ciuill warres*, and of *Nero, by vnterternty of succession*, and in *Augustulus, by his ouerthrow*, and of their seuerall healinges, is altogeather impertinent and ridiculous, for now we seeke only for one and the last, which maketh most to his purpose, is indeed flatly against him, since that in his opinion the Pope healed this wound, whom he would haue to be signified by the 2. beast; whereas the Scripture witnesseth

Downam impugneth himselfe.

that

that it was healed by the firſt Beaſt; and that before the ſecond appeared. Likewiſe if we will believe *M. Downam*, the healing of this wound, and the erecting of the Image is all one, ſince that both are nothing els, but the erecting of the Weſt Empire, vnder *Charles* the Great, and the like he muſt ſay of making the former beaſt to be worſhipped; for *M. Downam* hath no other deuiſe left for all theſe ſeuerall actions, but only the bare erecting of the *Roman* Empire by the Pope. And yet he will haue this alſo to be ſo mean a thing, that in ſubſtance it ſhalbe nothing at all, and that indeed not this new Emperour but the Pope himſelfe ſhalbe the head of the *Roman* Empire all this while, and the Emperour ſhall only ſtand for a cipher to make vp the number of 8. whereas notwithſtanding the Scripture plainely ſaith, that there are 8. without him, not heades as *M. Downam* ſeemeth to imagine, but Kings, the beaſt making one himſelfe, as the Scripture expreſly teſtifieth, *cap* 7. *v.* 12. which can by no meanes be vnderſtood of the *Roman* Empire, except *M. Downam* will make the Empire it ſelfe an Emperour, which is too abſurd; for of what ſhould it be Emperour? Wherefore it is manifeſt, that by the Beaſt is vnderſtood the Diuell, who indeed is diſtinct from the other 7. as is manifeſt, and therefore may well be accompted the 8. and yet b longeth to all the 7. becauſe he concurred with them all in their wickednes, and in the perſecution of the good; and it is alſo manifeſt, that he was in the world before Chriſts comming, much more then he hath bene ſince, and ſhalbe more againe hereafter in Antichriſts tyme, then euer he was before: after which he ſhall go into eternall deſtruction, as *S. Iohn* affirmeth.

By the beaſt *Apoc.*17. the Diuell is vnderſtood.

7. And by this we may ſee, that *Bellarmines* expoſition conteyneth no abſurdity at all, nor can be impugned by any ſound ground, ſo farre as concerneth the ſubſtance therof, for all that can be obiected againſt it, is, that it ſeemeth hard to explicate, how Antichriſt ſhould be ſignifyed by the beaſt himſelfe, and alſo by one of his heades, for which cauſe it is very probable, that it is not Antichriſt himſelfe, who ſhall receaue this deadly wound, but *Apoc.* 13.

but one of the 7. Kings ſignified by thoſe 7. heads, who
X. XI. ſhall concurre with Antichriſt in his wickedneſſe; for
XII. XIII that in this 13. Chapter *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of particuler Kings, and not of ſeuerall States, is manifeſt by that which hath bene ſaid, and ſhall heerafter be againe confirmed: And thus we may conclude this Chapter, for *M. Downam* replyeth not a word to *Bellarmines* anſwere to the obiection of the *Magdeburgians*.

THE

THE SIXTENTH CHAPTER.

Of the Kingdome, and Warres of Antichriſt.

OF the Kingdome and Warres of Antichriſt, we read (ſaith *Bellarmine*) 4. things in the Scriptures. Firſt, that Antichriſt riſing from a moſt baſe place ſhall obtayne the Kingdome of the Iewes by deceipt and craft. Secondly, he ſhall fight with 3. Kings, *viz.* of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Ethiopia*: and that he ſhall ouercome them, and poſſeſſe their Kingdomes. Thirdly, that he ſhall ſubdue other 7. Kings, and by that meanes become the Monarch of the whole world. Fourthly, that he ſhall perſecute the Chriſtians with an innumerable army through the whole world, and that this is the battayle of of *Gog* and *Magog*; of all which, ſince nothing agreeth to the Pope, it followeth manifeſtly, that he can by no meanes be called Antichriſt. I.

Of the firſt thus ſpeaketh *Dan. cap.* 11. *There ſhall ſtand in his place a contemptible one, and Kingly honour ſhall not be giuen to him, and he ſhall come ſecretly, and ſhall obtayne a Kingdome in deceipt.* Vpon which place *S. Hierome* wryteth, that although theſe words be in ſome ſort vnderſtood of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, yet II.

» yet they are far more perfectly to be fulfilled in Antichriſt,
Pſal. 71. » as thoſe things which are ſaid of *Salomon*, are indeed vnder-
» ſtood of *Salomon*, but are more perfectly fulfilled of Chriſt:
» wherefore *S. Hierome* in the ſame place after he had expoun-
» ded this place of *Antiochus*, following *Porphery* writeth
» thus: *But our men better and more rightly interprete, that Antichriſt*
» *ſhall do theſe things in the end of the world; who is to riſe of a meane na-*
» *tion that is of the people of the Iewes, and ſhalbe ſo baſe and abiect, that*
» *the Kingly honour ſhall not be giuen him, and he ſhall obtayne the Prince-*
» *dome by wiles and deceipts* &c. Where Saint *Hierome* ſignifieth,
» that this is the common expoſition of Chriſtians, for
» which cauſe alſo *Daniel cap.* 7. compareth Antichriſt with
» a little horne, viz. by reaſon of his baſe and obſcure be-
» ginning.

III. And certainly this firſt doth in no ſort agree to the
» Pope, for we ſhould ſay that the Pope was vntill the yeare
» 600. moſt obſcure and of no name, and that then ſuddainly
» and by deceipts he vſurped ſome high place. But this is
» manifeſtly falſe. For as *S. Auguſtine epiſt.* 162. ſaith: *In the*
» *Roman Church alwayſ flouriſhed the Princedome of the Apoſtolike Chayre,*
» and S. Proſper lib. 2. de vocat. gentium cap. 6. *Rome by the*
» *Princedome of preiſthood is made more ample by the ſortreſſe of Religion*
» *then by the throne of power*; and the Councell of *Calcedon epiſt. ad*
» *Leonem*, affirmeth, that at *Rome* do ſhine the Apoſtolike
» beames, which from thence extend themſelues to all, and
» communicate their treaſures with others. Finally euen
» that Heathen writer *Amianus Marcellus l.* 27. writing of the
» ſchiſme of *Damaſus*, and *Vrſicinus* ſaith, that he doth not mer-
» uayle, if men ſtriue ſo earneſtly for the Biſhopricke of
» *Rome*, ſince that the riches and amplitude of it are ſo
» great.

IIII. Of the ſecond, the ſame *Dan. cap.* 7. ſpeaketh thus: *I con-*
» *ſidered the hornes, and behould another little horne aroſe in the middeſt*
» *of them, and three of the firſt hornes were pulled vp before his face*;
» and after explicating: *Moreouer* (ſaith he) *the ten hornes, are ten*
» *Kinges, and another ſhall riſe after them, and he ſhalbe more mighty*
» *then the former, and ſhall humiliate* 3. *Kings*, And *cap.* 11. expli-
» cating who theſe three Kinges be, *He ſhall ſend his hand* (quoth
» he) *into lands, and the land of Egypt ſhall not eſcape: and he ſhall haue*

dominion

dominion of the treasures of gould and siluer, and in all the precious things of Egypt, and he shall passe also through Lybia, and Ethiopia. Vpon which places and especially vpon *cap. 7. S. Hierome* writing, saith: *Let vs say that which all Ecclesiasticall VVriters haue deliuered. In the consumation of the world, when the Kingdome of the Romans is to be destroyed there shalbe ten Kinges, who shall deuide the Roman world among st them, and there shall arise an eleuenth little King (Antichrist) who shall ouercome three of the ten Kinges, that is of the Egyptians, and of Africa, and Ethiopia, who being slaine, the other 7. Kinges, shall also submit themselues to the Conquerour.* The same doe teach of the three Kinges to be slaine by Antichrist, *S. Irenæus lib. 5. Lactantius lib. 7. cap. 16.* and *Theodoretus in cap. 7. & 11. Daniel.*

V. And this most of all refuteth the madnes of heretikes, who make the Pope Antichrist; for let them say, if they can, when the Pope slew the Kinges of *Egypt*, of *Lybia*, and *Ethiopia*, and vsurped their Kingdome? *Theodorus Bibliander* in his Chronicle saith, that the Pope, as a little horne shaked the first horne of the ten, when *Gregory* the second excommunicated *Leo* the Greeke Emperour the Image breaker, and prohibited the tributes of *Italy* to be rendred vnto him, and by little, and little obteyned his Princedome, that is, the Exarchate of *Rauenna*. He saith, that he shaked off the secõd horne, when Pope *Zacharie* deposed *Childerichus* King of the French, and commaunded *Pepin* to be created in his steed. Of the third he speaketh not plainely, but he seemeth to insinuate that the third horne was then stroken of when *Gregory* the 7. excommunicated and deposed *Henry* the 4. Emperour. There is also extant a certaine Epistle of *Fredericus* the second Emperour of that name, written against the Pope, in which he affirmeth, that the three hornes pulled vp by Antichrist, are the Kingdome of *Italy*, *Germany*, and *Sicilie*, which the Pope had chiefly made to serue him.

VI. But these are most vaine cauills, for first *Daniel* speaketh not of the Kingdome of *France*, or *Germany*, but of the Kingdome of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Ethiopia*. Besides, the Pope hath slaine none of those Kings, but Antichrist shall kill those 3. Kings, as *S. Hierome* saith. Likewise Antichrist shall vsurpe those Kingdomes to himself, and not giue them

» to others, but the Pope kept not the Kingdome of *France* » to himselfe, but gaue it to *Pepin*, and hauing deposed one » Emperour, commaunded another to be created, and vsur- » ped not the Empyre to himselfe. And in like manner when » he depriued the Emperour *Leo* of the Princedome of *Rauēna*, » he challenged not that Princedome to himselfe, but per- » mitted the Kinges of the *Lombardes* to haue it, which not- » withstanding afterward *Pepin* (hauing ouercome the *Lom-* » *bards*) gaue to the Pope. Finally, if to depose Princes, be to » shake off hornes, there will not be only three, but many more » pulled off by Antichrist. For it is manifest, that besides *Leo* » the 3. the Greeke, and *Childericke* the French King, there » haue bene deposed by Popes, *Henry* the 4. by *Gregory* the 7. » *Otho* the 4. by *Innocentius* the 3. *Frederike* the 2. by *Innocentius* » the 4. all which lost their Empyre in very deed.

VII. » Of the third we haue most plaine testimonies of the » ancient Fathers. *Lactantius lib. 7. cap. 16.* and *S. Irenæus lib. 5.* » say, that after Antichrist hath slaine 3. of the 10. Kings the » rest forthwith shall be subdued by him, and then he shalbe » Prince of all. *S. Hierome* in *cap. 11. Dan.* vpon that place, *And* » *he shall do those things, which his Fathers haue not done. None of the* » *Iewes* (saith he) *besides Antichrist euer reigned in the whole world.* » *S. Chrysostome* in 2. *Thess.* 2. affirmeth, that Antichrist shalbe » a Monarch, and succeed the Romans in the Monarchie, as » the *Romans* succeeded the *Grecians*, the *Grecians* the *Persians*, » and the *Persians* the *Assyrians*.

VIII. » Finally, *S. Cyril Cateches.* 15. saith, that Antichrist » shall obtaine the Monarchy, which was the Romans before, » and this opinion of the Fathers is euidently inferred out of » *Apoc.* 17. where we read: *And the ten hornes which thou hast seene,* » *are ten Kings. These haue one Counsell, and will giue their force and pow-* » *er to the beast*. Now it is cerrayne that this no way agreeth to » the Bishop of *Rome*, for the Pope neuer was King of the » whole world.

IX. » Of the 4. *S. Iohn* speaketh *Apoc.* 20. *And when the thousand* » *yeares shall be consummated, Sathan shalbe loosed out of his prison, and* » *shall go forth, and seduce the Nations, which are vpon the foure corners* » *of the earth, Gog, and Magog, and shall gather them into battaile, the* » *number of whome, is as the sand of the sea. And they ascended vpon the*

breadth

breadth of the earth, and compassed the Campe of the Saints, and the be- »
loued Citty. And there came downe fire from God out of Heauen, and de- »
voured them, and the Diuell which seduced them was cast into the poole »
of fire and brimstone, where both the beast and the false Prophet shalbe »
tormented day and night, for euer and euer. In these wordes is de- »
scribed the last persecution, and the end of it. Of which *S.* »
Augustine speaketh thus, *lib.* 20. *de ciuitate Dei, cap.* 11. *This shal-* »
be the last persecution, the last iudgment being at hand, which the Holy »
Church shall suffer in the whole world, viz. the whole Citty of Christ, of »
the whole Citty of the Diuell, how great soeuer both of them are vpon »
earth. The like are in *Ezechiel* 38. 39. which are briefly to be »
expounded by reason of many errours, which haue bene of this matter.

M. Downams Answere confuted.

1. MAISTER *Downam* answereth first *ioimly* to all these 4. points, that none of them are *found in the Scriptures*, which you must vnderstand according to his interpretation, who affirmeth, that *the Prophesies of* Daniel cap. 11. and 7. *were to haue their complement before the comming of the Messias*; which notwithstanding he acknowledgeth to be against both *Iewes*, and all ancient Christians, who all agree against *M. Downam*, that by the two legs of the Image *cap.* 2. and the fourth beast with 10. hornes *cap.* 7. the *Roman* Monarchy, and not the Kingdome of the *Seleucida* & *Lagida* is signifyed; which difference as *M. Downam* well noteth, is the occasion, why both the Iewes, & Christians constantly affirme, that all which is said of the two legs, and the fourth beast could not be fulfilled before the comming of Christ, but only thus far, that this fourth Kingdome of the *Romans* was to be in the world before his comming. Neither doth it follow hence, that whatsoeuer is spoken of the little horne *cap.* 7. 8. 11. is by them expounded, at least litterally of Antichrist: for first they all agree, that all the 8. Chapter is plainly to be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, and in no sort of Antichrist but only by application, and accommodation. Likewise in the 11. they admit so much to be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, as can be

1.

Dan. 7. 11.

Dan. 7. 8. 11.

Dan. 8.

Dan. 11.

applied to him, but all cannot, and therefore part must of force be referred to Antichrist euen litterally; and that which may be verified of *Antiochus*, must likewise be vnderstood of Antichrist, in whom it is more perfectly to be fulfilled. But in the 7. chap. there is no mention at all of *Antiochus*, but only of Antichrist, neither is it the same little horne, which is spoken of in that Chapter, and in the 8. as is most manifest: for the little horne in the 7. Chapter belongeth to the 4. beast, and that in the 8. to the third, that is to the Monarchy of the *Grecians*, and the successors of King *Alexander*, as is most manifest v. 8. & 9. where the 4. heads, which that Monarchy is said to haue *cap.* 7. because it was to be deuided among foure Kinges, after *Alexanders* death, are called 4. hornes, out of one of which this little horne is said to proceed, as indeed *Antiochus* did. But the little horne which is spoken of in the 7. *chap.* arose in the middest of the 10. hornes, which the 4. beast is said to haue. Now in the 11. *Chap.* there is not any mention of any hornes at all, but of the Kinges of *Egypt*, and *Syria*, and chiefly of *Antiochus*, and by occasion of him of Antichrist, as hath bene said.

Dan. 7.

The little horne *Dan.* 7. is not the same with the little horne *Dan.* 8.

2. But M. *Downam* telleth vs, that *the learned of our tymes, haue made the contrary cleere*: but he omitteth their proofes, and only alleadgeth out of *S. Hierome*, that *Porphyry that learned, though malicious enemy of Christianity, perceaued Daniels Propheſies in the 7. 8. 11. and 12. Chapters, so fully and perfectly to agree to Antiochus Epiphanes, that he affirmed that they were written not before hand by Daniel, but after the fulfilling of them by some one that liued in the tymes of Antiochus Epiphanes.* But M. *Downam* findeth not in *S. Hierome* those 4. Chapters specified, which he setteth down, but only a generall assertion, that *Daniel* seemed rather to haue written a story then a propheſy: yea *S. Hierome* plainly conuinceth both *Porphiry* and all his followers, which are M. *Downams* learned men, and himselfe, that neither the 7. nor the 11. and 12. Chapters can be wholy vnderstood of *Antiochus*, and in this agreed with him all writers, aswell Christians as Iewes, and in particuler *Methodius*, *Eusebius*, and *Apollinaris* wrote largely against *Porphyry* answering his mad obiections, among which no doubt this was one

Præfat. in Dan.

Hierome and three other ancient writers wrote expresly against Downams expositiō.

which

which *M. Downam* and his learned men take vpon them so stiffely to defend, and for that cause will seeme to some to pertake with *Porphyry* in his malicious cauills.

3. Thus far *M. Downam* hath byn constrained to fly to *Porphyry*, that wicked Gentile, against both Iewes and Christians. Now he hath gotten himselfe a Iew to ioyne with him against the Pope, for so he saith, that *not only Protestants, but also the Iewes, and namely R. Leui Gerson expoundeth the 7. and 11. chap. of Dan. as spoken of the Pope of Rome, whom he calleth another Pharao* which pleaseth this man very well, who thinketh that he hath gotte a great aduantage against the Pope, because not only Heretiks, but also Iewes themselues impugne him. And yet fearing least this *Rabbin* be not able to make his party good, he still sticketh rather to *Porphyry*, affirming, that only *Antiochus* is litterally spoken of in those places, and that consequently, there can no sound argument concerning Antichrist be taken from them, because *Antiochus* was a tipe of Antichrist, not in all and euery particuler, but in some principall matters. In which *M. Downam* sayth true, and I thinke there was neuer yet any so mad, as to auouch the contrary, and the like no doubt is to be said of the Types of Christ, which *M. Downam* alleageth, only the controuersy may be, what those principal matters are, in which *Antiochus* was the Type of Antichrist. But euen in these also he seemeth to affirme, that there can be no sound argument taken from the Tipe, for he vniuersally alloweth of *that rule of Diuinity, set downe by the Schoolemen, that, Theologia Symbolica non est argumentatiua*, which notwithstanding, he must vnderstand *præcisè, & per se*, as the Schoolmen do, in which sense it only signifieth, that it is no good argument in all poynts to argue from the Type, to that which it signifieth; which is all, that his other argumēt of Allegories proueth also. And consequently it wil stil be a good argument from the allegorical, mystical, or spirituall sense to infer such things as the type is a figure of. As for example, now that we know by the Scripture, that the Paschall Lambe was a figure of Christ, not only in other respects, but also in that the bones of it were not to be broken, we may very wel bring that place of *Exodus* 12. *nec os illius confrin-*

Dan. 7. 11

Antiochus a type of Antichrist only in some principall pointes.

How we may argue from the mysticall sense.

getie, to proue, that Christ had not his thighes broken, as the two theeues had. And the reason of this is, for that the mystical and spiritual sense, is as wel intended by the holy Ghost, as the Litteral or Hystorical, yea for the most part in the old Testament much more, as is euident by the place alleadged; wherfore the only cause, why we cannot vse it in our proofes, is, because it is hidden and vncertaine, so that when it is knowne certainly, it conuinceth as much as the litteral doth: for which cause the Apostles, to whom it was reuealed, vsed it so often. But we can proue nothing firmly eyther by the mystical, or litterall sense, except we be sure, that we haue the right of each, which we can neuer se by our owne wits and industry without the assistance of that spirit, with which al Scriptures were written. Neyther can any man in particuler without great presumption, & euident danger of errour, promise this assistance to himself, but no doubt the Church of Christ is neuer without it, & therfore we may boldly build vpon any exposition, which she houldeth for certayne, as she doth all those, in which all the Fathers, Doctors, and Pastors giuen vnto her, by her spouse, do fully agree, as we see they do in expounding this place of Antichrist: and therfore we are to be out of doubt, that it is a true exposition, whether it be litteral or spirituall, of which there may be some question; Neither doth *M. Downam* seeme much to striue, but that in some thinges concerning Antichrist, the proofe out of this place is good inough. But he would haue vs giue him leaue to choose them out, which we can do with no security, except he first shew vs an authenticall warrant, for so high & special a priuiledge: which because he can neuer be able to do, we must of force neglect his babling, and listen to the consent of the Fathers, to whom it doth belong to shew vs, in what points *Antiochus*, & Antichrist are to agree, and in what to differ, as *Bellarmine* doth in this place; though (as I noted before) there be many things in the 11. chapter. which cannot be vnderstood of *Antiochus*, and therfore are litterally to be referred to Antichrist, and much more all that, which is spoken of the little horne in the seauenth chapter, in which there is no mention of *Antiochus* at all.

Except the litteral sense be certain we cannot argue firmly from it.

The consent of the Fathers maketh eyther litterall or mysticall sense certaine.

4. After

4. After this generall answer, *M. Downam* commeth to *examine the particuler Instances*, and to the first he answereth in two sorts: First, that *Daniel speaketh not of Antichrist*, which he saith, *shall appeare out of Daniel himselfe, for Daniel speaketh of him, that immediately in the Kingdome of Syria succeeded Seleucus Philopater, for so he saith, in his place, who was described* vers. 20. *shall stand vp a vyle person, meaning therby Antiochus &c.* Thus *M. Downam*, prouing very well that *Antiochus* is spoken of, which no man denyed, and *Bellarmine* expresly alleageth *S. Hieromes* exposition in that sense; but withall addeth, that all Christians vnderstood it also of Antichrist, and that more rightly in *S. Hieromes* iudgment. This *M. Downam* should haue impugned: which he in no sort doth, by telling vs, that *Antiochus* is spoken of, because both *Antiochus* and Antichrist may be spoken of, if not litterally, at least spiritually, which is sufficient, so that it be certaine, that those words are to be applyed to him, as *S. Hierome* & the other Christians thought that they were. II. Dan. 11. Antichrist shall arise from base estate.

5. After this, *M. Downam* entreth into a large discourse, telling vs first, *that excepting one propheticall comfort of the Resurrection*, cap. 12. Daniels *whole Prophesie is of those things which happened within lesse then 700. yeares, that is to say, from the taking of Hierusalem by the Chaldeans, vnto the finall destruction therof by the Romans.* Where first we are glad, that we haue gotten *M. Downams* consent of that Prophesie of the *Resurrection*; for surely it is very probable, that it is not alone, but ioyned with many other concerning the consummation of the world, to which the comming of Antichrist doth belong. And this both the text it selfe, and *S. Hierome*, and all other Ecclesiasticall Wryters perswade vs, and therfore we must needs thinke so, vntill *M. Downam* conuinceth euidently the contrary, which I am affraid, he will very hardly doe. But let vs see, what he can say for himselfe. Secondly therfore he saith, that *Daniels Prophesies concerne, either such terrestriall Kingdomes, vnto whose Tyranny the Iewes were subiect before the comming of the Messias, or else the spirituall Kingdome of Christ, before which, all the former Kingdomes were to haue an end.* But this seemeth somwhat contrary to that he said before, when he confessed that *Daniels* Prophesie reacheth to the finall destruction Daniels prophesie cõtaineth many things cõcerning the end of the world. Downam contradicteth himselfe.

ction of *Ierusalem* by the *Romans*, and consequently there must needes in his opinion, be mention in *Dan.* of the terrestriall Kingdome of the *Romans*, which without doubt, was not ended, before the comming of Christ; well, we will not vrge him too far with this, but rather consider how he proueth, that all the terrestriall Kingdomes of which *Daniel* speaketh were to haue an end before the spirituall Kingdome of Christ, for it seemeth somewhat contrary to *Daniel* himselfe, who affirmeth, that the Kingdome of Christ should be raised by God in the daies of those Kingdomes, wherof he spake, *In diebus autem Regnorum illorum suscitabit Deus Cæli Regnum, quod in æternum &c.* But yet *M. Downam* bringeth for the contrary *Dan.* 2. 4. 35. and 7. 11. and *ver.* 26. 27. The first of which places is a little misprinted, for that 4. should be 34. in which, and the following verse it is said, that the stone, which was cut out of the Mountayne without handes (that is our Sauiour borne of our Blessed Lady by the holy Ghost without the seed of man) should strike the Statua vpon the yron feet, and breake them, and by that meanes the whole should be dissolued, and come to nothing. But I cannot see how this proueth *M. Downams* intent, but rather the quite contrary; for if our Sauiour shall destroy these Kingdomes, surely they were not to be ended before his comming, and at least the feet, and the ten toes must remayne, and be stroken by this stone; as indeed they shall at his second comming, when he shall ouercome the ten Kinges, among whom the *Roman* Empyre shalbe diuided; who shall fight against him as *S. Iohn* recordeth *Apoc.* 17. both before the comming of Antichrist and after also, so many, and so long as they shall continue. Neither may it seeme hard, that *Nabuchodonosor* in his dreame related by *Daniel*, did see the stone first strike the *Statua*, & after become so great, that it filled the whole world; for this is to be atributed to the obscurity of Propheſies, and therefore *Daniel* in his explication standeth not vpon that circumstance, but rather insinuateth the contrary, explicating first the stability and perpetuity of Christs Kingdome in this world; and then how he should destroy all the Kingdomes of this world, and finally reigne for euer in the

The Kingdomes whereof Daniel speaketh were not to be ended before Christ.

Dan. 2.

When our Sauiour is to destroy the Kingdomes, signified by the Statua of Nabuchodonosor.

next

next. The second place *cap.* 7. 11. is most plainely against *M. Downam*, for in the two precedent verses is described the comming of God to iudgement, before which no doubt, all these Kingdomes and Kinges, togeather with Antichrist himselfe shall haue an end, and the same is as plainely repeated *v.* 26. in which is declared both the comming of God to Iudgement, and the finall ouerthrow, and destruction of the wicked, and *v.* 27. the amplitude and perpetuity of the Kingdome of Christ and his Saintes, which is chiefly to be vnderstood of the next world, and only spiritually in this; after which manner Christ began to ouerthrow all the Kingdomes of the world from the beginning, by rooting out Idolatry, and planting his Church through the whole world. Those other places, which *M. Downam* quoteth concerning the comming of Christ into this world, and the destruction of *Ierusalem* make nothing against vs, though some of them are not very fitly applied by him as the Reader will easily discerne of those, which he bringeth out of the new Testament. But I will let them passe, and only note that which maketh a little to our purpose, that *M. Downam* misinterpreteth *Dan.* 7. 13. of the ascension of our Sauiour, wheras it is euident by the text, that it is to be vnderstood of his comming to Iudgement, of which it is said *v.* 10. *Iudicium sedit, & libri aperti sunt*, that God the Father did sit in Iudgment and the bookes were opened, that is, it was the tyme of Iudgement, when *Daniel* did see our Sauiour come to him. After this *M. Downam* only reciteth his exposition of the 4. beast *cap.* 7. and the leggs and feete of the Statua *cap.* 2. which he will needes haue to be the Kingdome of the *Seleucidæ*, and *Lagidæ*, but how foolishly, we shall see after, when he commeth to his proofes, for now he only affirmeth it vpon his bare word, which with vs hath no credit at all, and I thinke will not haue much with any man els, at least, if he be any thing indifferent, and will vouchsafe to read this discourse.

Dan. 7.

When Christ began spiritually to ouerthrow those Kingdomes.

Matth. 2. & 3. *Mar.* 1. & 10.

Dan. 7.

Dan. 2. & 7.

6. Well *M. Downam* goeth forward with his exposition (such as it is) especially of the 11. Chapter of *Dan.* in which he saith many thinges called in question by none,

Dan. 11.

and others denied by all; of the first sort I need say nothing; and the other are so apparently false and foolish, that it wilbe inough to touch them briefly; as first, when he saith, that in the 8. *and* 11. *chap. the* 3. *latter, and especially the last Kingdome spoken of cap.* 2. *and* 7. *is prophesied of*; who seeth not the absurdity of this assertion? for what can be more plaine, then that the foure Kingdomes, into which *Alexanders* Kingdome was deuided after his death, belong to the same Monarchy signified by the 3. beast *cap.* 7. which for this cause, is said to haue 4. heads in that place, and in the 8. *chap.* the same are signified by the 4. hornes, and they all were Greeks as *M. Downam* confesseth *nu.* 10. and is euident out of the same 8. Chapter; and of the *Seleucide* the same appeareth 1. *Machab.* 11. and besides all these 4. Kingdomes were ended before the comming of our Sauiour, who notwithstanding is said to ouerthrow the 4. beast; and consequently all the rest in him, since that he had succeeded in their places. *Porphiry* did see this difficulty, which *M. Downam* dissembleth, and therefore interpreted *Iudas Machabeus* to be that stone which *Dan.* speaketh of *cap.* 2. but most ridiculously, as is manifest out of the text; and therefore *M. Downam* durst not go so far with him, though in this place he affirmeth, that in *Antiochus* his tyme the people of God were freed from the tyranny of the *Seleucide* by *Iudas Machabeus*; which is all the ouerthrow he can shew vs, that the stone gaue to the Statua, or 4. beast. Finally how can two of these Kingdomes, into which *Alexanders* Kingdome was deuided, be taken for the Kingdome signified by the 4. beast, which *cap.* 7. is affirmed to be greater then all Kingdomes, and to deuour the whole earth? whereas all those 4. Kingdomes togeather are said *cap.* 8. to be inferiour to that of *Alexander, non in fortitudine eius*, as it is also manifest by experience, that they were, and much more to all Kingdomes, or to that which was to be greater then they all, and to deuour the whole earth. Neither is it true, that these 4. Kingdomes were by mutuall conflictes reduced to two, vnder *Seleucus Nicanor*, and *Ptolomy Lagides*; for (to omit the controuersy about the 4. Kingdome, whether it were of *Asia minor*, or of *Thracia*, and *Ponius*) it is certaine that there were

The 4. Kingdomes, into which that of Alexãder was deuided belong to the 3. beast described Dan. 7. & not to the 4.

The Kingdomes of the Lagidæ and Seleucidæ cannot be signified by the 4. beast Dan. 7.

were 14. Kinges of *Macedonia*, which held that Kingdome aboue an hundred yeares, and 1. *Machab.* 1. they are all foure ſaid to haue reigned after *Alexander*, and their Children after them many yeares.

But no part of *M. Downams* expoſition is more abſurd, then his applications of the 10. Kinges of the *Seleucida* and *Lagida* to the 10. hornes of the beaſt mentioned *cap.* 7. for (to omit that this was *Porphyries* deuiſe, by which he made himſelfe ridiculous to all other expoſitours) *M. Downams* particuler application conteyneth ſo many abſurdityes, as I am perſuaded his freindes will bluſh, and all others will pitty the poore man; for firſt, whereas he putteth *Seleucus Nicanor* to be the 2. horne, taking one King of *Egypt*, and the next of *Syria*, becauſe *Ptolomy Philadelphus* who was the ſecond King of *Egypt* was a great fauourer of the Iewes, he is conſtrayned to interprete the 5. *verſe* of the 11. Chapter of this *Seleucus Nicanor*, againſt all expoſitours, euen his owne *Tremellius* and *Iunius*, who by thoſe wordes, *& de Principibus eius &c.* or as they read it: *alter ex Principibus eius*, vnderſtand *Ptolomæus Philadelphus*, whom *M. Downam* will by no meanes acknowledg to be any of theſe 10. hornes; and conſequently the ſecond horne is not to be found in this 11. Chapter, as neither the 2. and another King, which is none of theſe hornes, is mentioned in their place, by which *M. Downams* aſſertion, *that the 10. hornes which ſucceſſiuely tyrannized ouer Iury are mentioned in order in this 11. Chapter*, is wholy ouerthrown. Likewiſe he omitteth *Seleucus Ceraunus* elder brother to *Antiochus Magnus*, though he alſo be mentioned in this Chapter. Fynally of all theſe 10. which he nameth hornes, becauſe they tyrannized ouer the people of the Iewes, he cannot proue, that aboue two of them perſecuted, or in a manner moleſted the Iewes: indeed they were ſo buſied with their owne affayres, that they were rather glad to procure the Iewes to be their friends, then to exaſperate them. *Ptolomy Lagides* the firſt King of *Egypt* did inuade *Ieruſalem*, as other hiſtories report, but *Daniel* omitted it, which is a ſigne, that his intent in numbring theſe Kinges, was not to declare the perſecution, with which they were to afflict the Iewes, as *M. Downam* imagineth. Beſides him, it is only certaine,

Downams expoſition contrary to all others, euen his owne fellowes.

Downam contradicteth himſelfe.

that *Antiochus Epiphanes*, the last horne in *M. Downams* accompt did the like, for that which he affirmeth of *Ptolomy Philopater* out of the 12. verse, is a meere fable, since it is manifest out of *Polybius lib.* 5. and other historics, that the thousands, which there he is foretould to ouerthrow, were of the army of *Antiochus Magnus*, for he slew and tooke prisoners aboue 10. thousand. And as for *Antiochus Magnus* himselfe, true it is, that he came to *Ierusalem*, not against the Iewes, but against *Scopas* one of *Ptolomyes* Captaines, against whom the Iewes themselues assisted *Antiochus*, with which he was so well pleased, that he certified his Captaynes of the Iewes good vsage towards him, & how he had decreed to reward them; for which cause he is by *Iosephus* accompted one of their benefactors. And the like we may say of *Seleucus Philopater* his elder sonne in whose commendation the Scripture it selfe speaketh 2. *Mach.* 3. & 4. testifying, that in his tyme the Citty of *Ierusalem* was in all peace, and the Temple honoured with many guifts, aswell by him, as it had byn before by his predecessors, and that he in particuler allowed all things necessary to the Sacrifices; and that which *M. Downam* obiecteth against him, that he *sent to exhaust and empty the treasury and Temple of Ierusalem*, the Scripture relateth the matter at large in the same place, and sheweth, how that action of his proceded from the false information and instigation of *Symon*, who was appointed to keep & defend the Temple, and of *Apollonius* Gouernour of *Caloſyria* and *Phenices*, whom *Symon* had moued to that effect, and tould, that the treasure was common, and not apperteyning to the Sacrifices. But that this proceeded not from the King, is manifest by that action of *Onias* the High Priest, who to defend himselfe from the vexations of *Symon* and *Apollonius*, tooke it to be his best course, to go himselfe to the King, and to put himselfe vnder his Kingly protection, which seemeth to haue stood him in good steed, since the Scripture maketh no mention of any further trouble in that Kings dayes, but presently addeth these words, *Sed post Seleuci vitæ excessum cùm suscepisset regnum Antiochus &c.* By which plainely appeareth the difference betwixt those two Kinges, and how those wicked courses which *Seleucus* hindered, were set forward by *Antiochus*.

Antiochus magnus & Seleucus Philopater his elder sonne, were the Iewes benefactors.

Only Antiochus Epiphanes is in the Scripture accounted a persecutor of the Iewes.

tiochus. And indeed, this is the only King, whom the Scripture accompteth a persecutor of the Iewes, and therfore *Dan.* 8. there is no mention of any of the rest, but only of the 4. among which *Alexanders* Monarchy was deuided, and forthwith after them of this *Antiochus*, and in the 11. Chapter, as we haue seene, though many of the others be specified, yet there is no mention, that any of them persecuted the Iewes, but only of the warres, which they had among themselues. There remayneth yet the greatest absurdity containing a flat corruption and contradiction of the Scripture, in that *M. Downam* maketh the litle horne, which arose after the 10. to be one of the 10. and the 10. But because I haue had occasion tō handle this point heeretofore, I will not weary the Reader with a needles repetion.

8. After this *M. Downam* cōmeth againe to proue, that the first place which *Bellarmine* citeth, is to be *vnderstood of Antiochus*, which no man denieth, and therfore all that labour is lost, vnles he would infer out of that, that it is not to be vnderstood of Antichrist, but that also were fooliſh as we haue seen. And it is litle better to infer, that it *Antichrist be spoken of in this place, he was to be the immediate successor of Seleucus Philopater*: for who seeth not, that this is a personall propriety of *Antiochus*, which could not be fulfilled in any, but himselfe; so that *M. Downam* might aswell infer, that Antichrist cannot be spoken of in this place, except he had bin *Antiochus* himself: which indeed is his wonted figure of *petitio principij*. Wherfore we say, that *Antiochus*, who was *Seleucus* his brother, and succeeded him in his kingdome, was in the māner of getting it set downe in the Scripture a figure of Antichrists cōming to his, and this is that which *S. Hierome*, & all Christian writers affirme against *Porphiry*, and his like. But now *M. Downā* denieth, that *Antiochus did arise from most base estate, because he was Sonne to Antiochus the great & Brother to Seleucus Philopater*. As though a Kings Sonne, and Brother, may not be obscure and abiect in a kingdome, out of which he hath liued, and in which he had no right or title, nor yet power to succeed; for it were too much simplicity in *M. Downam* to imagine, that *Hierome* and *Bellarmine* spake of baſenes of birth

Downam speaketh fooliſhly and from the purpose.

How Antiochus Epiphanes arose frō base estate.

birth, since that it is euident, they only speake of him in
Dan. 11. that sort in respect of the obtaining of the kingdome secretly, and by deceipt, and not by force, whereas otherwise he was by all thought vnworthy to be King. And as for *M. Downams* exposition of the word *vile*, or *despised* in *Dan.* no doubt sometime it may signifie wicked; and now I will not
Why Seleucus Philopater is called Vilissimus. contend whether *Seleucus Philopater* also *be called* Vilissimus *in the vulgar translation, because of his base poling of the people*, though *M. Downams* friends translate it otherwise, by which it appeareth, that the Hebrew word is not all one in both places, and besides many of *Seleucus Philopaters* predecessours were as wicked as he, and therfore it is more probable, that he was called *Vilissimus*, rather because he lived obscurely without doing any memorable act, for which cause he is also said to raigne but a few daies, though he were King twelue yeares. But to omit all this, *M. Downam* cannot deny, but that one may be called abiect, vile, base, contemptible, despised, or what it pleaseth him, by reason of his obscure life, and vnfitnes, want of meanes, and vnworthines of the dignity which he pretendeth: and when the word is to be taken in this sense, we must gather out of the text, and the circumstances, which concurre in the History, and Person, out of which no man can deny but that *S. Heromes* sense is most cleare; and if we speake of *Antiochus* before he was King, it is more then *M. Downam* can proue, that he was known to be so exceeding wicked, that he deserued to be called vile in that respect, and after he was King for all his wickednes he came to be called Noble, and is so named in all Histories, yea in the Scripture it self.

9. Now wheras *M. Downam* sayth, that though *Antiochus be a type of Antichrist, yet from hence we must infer not the selfe same particuler, which is proper to the person of Antiochus, but the like.* It is very true in this, though sometime this rule doth not hould, as is manifest in the example of *Exodus*, where the Paschall Lambe is a figure of our Sauiour in that particuler of not hauing the bones broken, but in this, it is true, and so nether *S. Hierome* and *Bellarmine*, or any of the rest do infer that Antichrist shall vse the same deceipt that *Antiochus* did, but the like, nor that he shall obtayne *the same Kingdome*, as

M. Dow-

M. Downam very ridiculously would beare his Reader in hand: for who knoweth not, that *Antiochus* was not only King of the Iewes, but of *Syria* and *Asia* which *S. Hierome* inferreth not of Antichrist, only he nameth the Kingdome of the Iewes, because it is manifest out of other places, as hath byn shewed, that Antichrist shall make himselfe their King and Messias. But it was far from *S. Hierome* and *Bellarmine* to proue it out of this place. And to this I might aduod, that by the Kingdome of the Iewes, they meane not the country of Iewry, but rather the dominion ouer that Nation, and their persons, whersoeuer they be. For it is vncertaine, whether there shalbe any Iewes in that Country at Antichrists comming or no, and it seemeth more probable, that they shall recouer it in his time, and by his meanes. Wherfore *S. Hierome* and *Bellarmine* only endeauour to proue out of this place, that Antichrist shall haue an obscure beginning, and come to be King by deceipt, which *M. Downam* might haue perceaued by *Bellarmins minor*, or Assumption, in which he neuer goeth about to proue, that the Pope is not Antichrist, because he is not King of the Iewes, which had bene his best and readyest way, if he had inferred out of this place, that Antichrist shalbe so: and wheras *M. Downam* saith, that to argue *from an allegory, is but a sleight argument in Diuinity*, I haue already shewed, that when the allegoricall sense is certayne, and knowne by the generall consent of Fathers, as it is in this place, the argument is not sleight, but most firme and strong, and *M. Downam* is most ridiculous in affirming, that *S. Hierome* is *ouerseene, and that it is a wonder, he being one of the most learned Fathers, and the matter so easy*: for who seeth not the insolent vanity of this heriticall Doctor, who perswadeth himselfe, that his bare word is able to discredit *S. Hieroms* exposition, whose learning and exactnes in the Scripture, the whole world admireth, and it is hard to find any place in the exposition, whereof he is so earnest as in this, impugning *ex professo*, the exposition of *Porphiry* whō *M. Downā* taketh vpon him to defend, and that not only agaynst *S. Hierome*, but against all other Christian, and Ecclesiasticall expositours, either before or after *S. Hieromes* time. Finally *M. Downam* is too impudent and absurd, to make a shew

Antichrist is not proued to be the King of the Iewes because Antiochus was so.

Downam insolently reiecteth S. Hierõe.

Downam abuseth S. Hierome.

shew, as if S. *Hierome* meant to proue out of the 23. 7. that Antichrist shalbe of a small Nation, since he himselfe acknowledgeth, that S. *Hierome* expounedeth those words otherwise, but this is the fruite of Heresy, first to make men impugne the truth, and the Doctors of Gods Church, who defend it, and then to seeke by such seely shifts to make their party seeme good, and to deceaue their Readers, by which indeed to any indifferent and discreet Reader, they discouer theyr owne shame, as M. *Downam* doth in this place, as well by this, as also by his simple repetition of his exposition of the fourth beast, and his 10. hornes, which notwithstanding he will now go about to proue, by impugning the exposition of all other but Infidels and Hereticks, concerning that place.

10. But first, he will haue a saying to the Pope, & infer that according to their exposition who think that the 4. beast, *Cap.* 7. signifieth the *Roman* Empire, it is *very likely, that the Pope is* Antichrist, *seing hitherto he is the last that hath ruled in Rome, and shall according to the Papists owne conceipt continue to the end*, but it is no meruaile, though M. *Downam* insisteth not much vpon this proofe, for first it is manifest, that not the Pope, but the Emperour is he that succeedeth in the *Roman* Empire, and it is likewise false, that the *Papists* hould, that either the Pope, or the Emperour shall *continue to the end* in *Rome*: since they plainly affirme, that the Empire shalbe first deuided among 10. Kings, wherof none of them shalbe Emperour, and after surprised by Antichrist himself, who shall subdue those 10. Kings: and it is likewise more probable in their conceipt, that *Rome* it self shalbe vtterly ouerthrowne by the same 10. Kings and Antichrist, as we haue seene before, and yet besides these two false assertions, M. *Downam* to make his argumēt good, suppoſeth two other (*ifs*) as false as these. First, that the ten hornes should be the successiue *rulers of the Roman state*: and 2. that the 10. *or last horne should be Antichrist*; which are not only false, but also foolish suppositions, and the latter expresly against the Scripture which maketh Antichrist not the 10. but the 11. horne, as hath byn proued. Now let vs see how he can proue, that by the 4. beast is signified, not the Roman, but the *Seleucidæ*, and first he inferreth

The Pope succeedeth not in the Roman Empyre.

The Seleucidæ are not signified by the fourth beast.

Dan. 7.

ferreth it, out of that falſe ground, which we haue already ouerthrowne, that the kingdome ſignified by the fourth beaſt, *was to haue an end before the comming of the Meſſias*, but he bringeth no proofes for this, but only quoteth *cap.* 7. 11. 26. 27. which we haue already ſhewed to make againſt him.

Secondly, he ſuppoſeth, that *cap.* 7. *v.* 25. 26. 27. is to be vnderſtood of *Antiochus his warres againſt the Iewes*, which is his common fault of *petitio principij*, and againſt the conſent of all good expoſitours, and the text it ſelfe.

Thirdly, he obiecteth that of the *Romans*: *After they had obtayned the dominion of Iewry, there were more then ten that ruled ouer the Holy Land.* But what is this to the purpoſe, ſince that theſe ten horns ſignifie 10. Kings, which ſhall raign togeather, as appeareth plainly by *Apoc.* 17. which *M. Downam* obiecteth to himſelfe, and only anſwereth, that theſe of *Dan.* 7. are not the ſame, but other 10. *which tyrannized ouer the Kingdome of the Iewes ſucceſſiuely, as they are particularly deſcribed cap.* 11. but how falſe this is, hath already appeared; as likewiſe that which he addeth, that he whom the Papiſts take to be Antichriſt, in *Daniel* is one of the 10. hornes, it being manyfeſt that both *Daniel*, & *S. Io.* deſcribe 10, beſides him. *Apoc.* 17. *Dan.* 11. *cap.* 5. *nu.* 2.

Fourthly, he ſaith, that all that *Dan.* ſaith of the 10. horne (ſo he calleth the 11.) *do fully and wholy agree to Antiochus Epiphanes, but not to the* 10. *Prince of the Romans.* But we ſhall ſee a litle after, how well *M. Downam* can apply the pulling vp of 3. hornes to *Antiochus*, which that little horne *cap.* 7. is ſaid to do, and I beleue we ſhall find him as far to ſeeke, as he that would goe about to ſhew the ſame of the 10. Prince of the *Romans*, which no wiſe man will do, and *M. Downam* knoweth well inough that *Bellarmine* neuer imagined any ſuch matter.

Fifthly, *M. Downam* argueth from his *conference of that, which is written of the little horne, chapter* 7. *with thoſe things which are more plainely recorded of* Antiochus, *chap.* 8. 23. *&c. and chap.* 11. 21. *&c.* But what meruaile is there, if the 7. and 11. *Chapters* agree, ſince they are both to be vnderſtood of Antichriſt, as hath bene proued, and

 like-

likewise *Antiochus* was a figure of Antichrist, and therefore no meruaile, though that which is said of him *cap. 8.* be very like to those things which are related of Antichrist in those other places; and yet *M. Downam* much misliketh in making the Goat buck *cap. 8.* to comprehend the 2. last beasts *cap. 7.* for of this he neyther bringeth proofe nor probability, only he sheweth very well, that the 4. heads of the third beast *cap. 7.* signify the same, that the 4. hornes of the goat *cap. 8.* and consequently that the *Seleucide* and *Lagide*, which were two of those hornes, belong to the third beast, and in no sort to the fourth. All the rest which he addeth is an idle repetition of his former foolishes already confuted. 6. He affirmeth without all proofe, that the *people pushed by and oppressed by these hornes, are the people of the Iewes, whereas Antichrist in the Papists conceipt, shalbe the counterfeit Messias of the Iewes*: for he can only proue that *Antiochus* persecuted the Iewes, which is no argument to proue, that Antichrist shall persecute them also, since it is manifest, that the Iewes in those tymes, were not a figure of the Iewes in Antichrists tyme, but of the Christians, whom I suppose *M. Downam* will not deny to be now Gods elected people. 7. He argueth from the agreement of the tymes, set down in *Dan.* to that which happened in *Antiochus*. But of this we haue treated sufficiently before, shewing, that he hath no ground for that he saith, and besides it is most true that the tyme mentioned *cap. 8.* agreeth most fitly to *Antiochus*, the other not, though if they did, it were only an argument, that in this *Antiochus* was a most exact figure of Antichrist. And this is all he can say for his new exposition of the *Seleucida*, or against that of *S. Hierome*, and all other good Authors.

The Seleucidæ & Lagidæ belong to the third beast.

Cap. 8.

III. 11. Now at length *M. Downam* commeth to *Bellarmines* assumption, or *Minor*, where first he telleth vs, that the *Pope ariseth from base estate, whether we consider the meane estate of the first Bishop of Rome, or the base birth and obscure parentage of diuers Popes*; and addeth, that *Bellarmines* allegations are *but a vaine flourish, nothing appertaining to this purpose*. But what impudency is this? Do not those authorities plainly shew, that the Popes of *Rome* were highly esteemed of, both among Christians, & Gentiles, long before the times that the Protestats assigne for Antichrists.

The Popes whom the Protestats accompt Antichrist arise not from base estate.

Antichrists comming: and consequently, that those Popes which they most foolishly, and impiously assigne, did not arise from base estate. But (saith he) *the estate of the first Bishops of Rome was meane*. Well suppose it were so, what were this against those Popes which you make Antichrist, whose estate was not meane as *Bellarmine* proueth, as indeed the state of the first cannot be said to be by any, that maketh account of (spirituall) preheminence and authority, and preferreth it before any temporall dignity whatsoeuer? But in these worldly Ministers eyes, our Sauiour himselfe would seeme meane, if he were vpon earth againe in the manner that he was: And his other obiection is as foolish, *of the base birth, and obscure parentage of diuers Popes*. As though this were the blames, that we speake of now, or the Protestants impugned any particuler Pope, and not the whole succession of them for these 1000. yeares? But if he would haue said any thing to the purpose, he should haue shewed, as *Bellarmine* rightly saith, that the Pope vntill the yeare 600. was most obscure, & of no name, and that then suddainly, and by deceipts he vsurped some high place. This *M. Downa* neuer toucheth, but passeth it ouer, as though he had byn blind, as no doubt he was with malice, which made him breake out into such a fit of raying without all modesty or measure, which therfore I omit in this place, & reserue all such stuffe to the 2. Part, especially since *M. Downam* acknowledgeth that now it is not to the purpose: only the Reader must not let passe his charge against *Bellarmine*, *for cunningly passing ouer in silence* the other part of fraud and deceipt, which he may see by the wordes, which now I alledged out of *Bellarmine* to be most false. Truest is, that he bringeth no distinct proofs for this, but only by shewing the Popes greatnes before the yeare 600. euidently conuinceth, that he came not to it then by any fraud or deceipt, but succeeded into the lawfull Inheritance of his Predecessours: for as I said before, now the question is not of the election of any particuler Pope, but whether the Popes in generall did at that tyme obtayne by fraud any great dignity, being base before. And thus *M. Downam* concludeth his discourse concerning this first argument, omitting, as the Reader may consider, the greatest

See part. 2. cap. 5.

Downam chargeth Bellarmin vniustly.

Downam omitteth Bellarmin his argument.

part of it, which is taken from the littlenesse of the horne *cap.* 7. by which he will haue *Antiochus* to be signified, and yet contendeth, that he was not little, but rather alway great: which two assertions, how they hang togeather, I leaue to the Readers iudgement.

IV. 12. To *Bellarmines* second argument, he hath nothing else to answere, but to tell vs, that the *4. beast is the Kingdome of the Seleucida & Lagida*, and *that the 10. horne* (he meaneth the 11.) *was Antiochus Epiphanes*. All which hath ben sufficiently confuted already: wherefore we are now only to note how he contradicteth himselfe in explicating how *Antiochus Epiphanes* was little, before his comming to the Crowne: for now besides his vile and base conditions, he can tell vs, that he was called little, *because of his yul kenes to be King. First, because he was the 3. and yongest sonne of Antiochus Magnus, his elder brother Seleucus also hauing a sonne called Demetrius. Secondly, because he was to be a perpetuall hostage at Rome*; wherefore he must needs graunt, that *Antiochus* may be called *despectus, cap. 11. 21.* aswell for these reasons and the like, as for his base conditions, which a little before he denied so obstinatly. Now the 3. *hornes*, which the Scripture saith were *to be pulled vp before the little horne*, M. *Downam* will by no meanes haue to be *Kinges of other Kingdomes then Syria*, and much lesse *of diuers, as of Egypt, Lybia, and Ethiopia*, but the 3. immediate predecessors of *Antiochus*, and this he proueth, because they were *expressly called the 3. former hornes, viz. of the ten*. But he knoweth well inough, that these 3. Kinges are named *cap. 11.* as we shall see forthwith. And besides the absurdityes, which this exposition conteyneth as we haue already shewed, why doth he not shew vs what these 3. immediate predecessors were, whom *Antiochus* made away? According to the succession of the Kinges of *Syria*, which he himselfe alloweth they should be *Seleucus Ceraunus* his Vncle, *Antiochus Magnus* his Father, and *Seleucus Philopater* his brother, and though *Antiochus Epiphanes* were so wicked, that in that respect it might be though that he would be ready inough to contriue any mischiefe, yet to affirme all this without either History or other witnes is a strange liberty, if not of lying, yet at least of faygning. The death of his brother *Seleucus Philopater* is affirmed

Antichrist shall ouerthrow 3. Kings.

Dan. 7.

Dan. 11.

firmed by *M. Downam* to haue ben contriued by *Heliodorus*, whom he affirmeth to haue ben ſuborned by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and quoteth *v.* 20. as though all this were Scripture: but there is no ſuch matter, and *Appianus in Syriaco*, who affirmeth that *Heliodorus* ſlew him treacherouſly, likewiſe affirmeth, that he would haue made himſelfe King, and that they who put him back, admitted *Antiochus*; by which it appeareth, that *Heliodorus* was not ſo much deuoted to *Antiochus*, as *M. Downam* imagineth. And it is eaſie to anſwere to that proofe, that the 3. hornes, are *called the 3. former*: for it is plaine, that *Daniel* calleth them ſo, becauſe they appeared vnto him before the little horne, and were likewiſe to be in the world before it, yea if we would ſtand ſtrictly vpon that word, and admit *M. Downams* interpretation, that thoſe 10. hornes were to reigne ſucceſſiuely; we ſhould rather ſay that the 3. former, or firſt were the 3. firſt predeceſſors of *Antiochus* then the 3. laſt, which were rather to be called the 3. Latter. But ſince the truth is, that all the 10. were to be togeather, there can no order of firſt or laſt be appointed vs among them, and therfore we muſt of force ſay that they were called 3. of the firſt, becauſe the 10. appeared before the little one; for indeed they are not called *the 3. former hornes*, as *M. Downam* auoucheth, but 3. *of the former*; betwixt which there is a great difference, euen as much as betwixt Gods truth and *M. Downams* lye. And all this is made more plaine in the expoſition of this viſion *v.* 24. where this little horne is expounded to be another King, which ſhall ariſe after the 10. and be more mighty then the former, and ſhall humiliate 3. Kinges; where we ſee, that this little horne is ſaid to be after the 10. and the 10. before it; but the 3. are ſet downe without any particuler order, becauſe they were to be of the 10. among which there is no order deſcribed. Now, that which he addeth of *Antiochus* being a *Type* &c. is a meere fabling, and already confuted; beſides that *Antiochus* can be no type in this place, where he is not ſpoken of at all, as hath ben ſhewed. Likewiſe that loud lye, which he telleth of *Gregory* the 7. affirming, that it is *well knowne, that he made away 6. of his predeceſſors by poyſon*, argueth ſo ſhameles an impudency, as nothing more. Like vnto

Why the 3. Kinges which Anti-christ ſhall ſlay, are called the 3. firſt or former.

Downam corrupteth the Scripture.

Downam belieth Pope Gregory the 7. and the Cardinalls.

which, is the computation of the Cardinalls, among whome he affirmeth, that it is *an ordinary practice to minister an Italian drugge to their Pope*: In proofe whereof he alleageth that *there haue beene 3. Popes in the tyme of Queene Elizabeths raigne*: and that *Vrbanus 7. Gregory 14. and Innocentius the 9. were so sodainly plucked vp, that he suppoſeth their names haue beene heard of to few in England*. And is not this a great wonder, that 3. old men ſhould dy in more then 40. yeares? Or that a young Woman liuing in all pleaſure ſhould outliue them all? Theſe are M. *Downams* myracles, and as for the 3. Popes, whome he nameth, they were all moſt vertuous and holy men, but extreme old; and therfore no meruaile though their being ſo cloſe in the conclaue cauſed the one, if not two of them to dy ſo ſoone; *Gregory* lay ſicke of the ſtone aboue 7. weeks, and the other two had beene Popes ſo little a tyme, and giuen ſo little offence to any, that there could be no ſuſpition of any poyſon: but this is the Miniſters charity.

Vrbanus 7.

Innocent. 9.

Gregory 14.

13. To the place, which *Bellarmine* alleageth out of *Dan.* 11. to this purpoſe, *M. Downam* anſwereth: 1. that *Daniel ſpeaketh not of Antichriſt*, to which I need not reply any more. 2. that *though Antiochus were a type in this, yet the ſame part is not to be applied to Antichriſt*. But *M. Downam* miſtaketh the matter much: for this is one of the places, which cannot be applyed to *Antiochus*, and therfore is litterally to be vnderſtood of Antichriſt. 3. *M. Downam* boldly affirmeth, that this place, *is only to be expounded of Antiochus his ſpoyling of Egipt, hauing with his company the Lybians, and the Ethiopians*. And to this purpoſe he propoſeth his new reading *according to the Hebrew: the Lubims and Cushims, that is the Lybians and Ethiopians, ſhalbe in his paſſages or voyages*, and leaſt we ſhould with *Bellarmine* obiect the authority of *S. Hierome*, and the other Fathers againſt him, he preuenteth vs by writing thus: *Now if Hierome or any of the Fathers haue let fall any ſuch thing (as Bellarmine ſaith) we are to eſteeme it as an excrement of theirs, which we are to paſſe by; rather then with the Cucanone, the Papiſts, to gather it vp, as fit food for their ſoules*; and then he hath this note in the margent, *Cacamen ouſly re- iecteth the Fathers.* *quod in eſt apud Indos, quæ alterius auis aſſecla eſt, cibus veſtatus excrementis: Scalig. de ſubtil.* What ſhould a man ſay to this filthy Companion, that dareth open his foule mouth to ſuch oppro-

opprobrious words against the Fathers? Are not their sooles in a manner taking, that follow such counsell? But his blasphemous railing against God and his Saincts, in which he imitateth his Maister Antichrist, must not feare to reach cleaning to the Fathers, given vnto the Church by Christ for her Pastors, Guides, and Doctours, and therfore we nothing doubt, but that S. Hieromes interpretation, and exposition of this place, approued and imbraced by all Ecclesiasticall Writers, both before and after him, is to be preferred before M. Downams new deuise, and the Hebrew text, which hath ad greſſum eius, if we beleiue Tremellius and Iunius, inualuable of S. Hieromes translation, as of M. Downams; and the words immediately going before plainly shew, that S. Hieromes interpretation is the right, which are, Extulit vexillum suum in terras, and after nameth only these three, two of which M. Downam would cut off by his new translation, and consequently must also change that terra, into terrum; and yet then then also the coherence would shew, that the Prophet spake rather of inuasion, then assisting, of enemyes then friends. But besides this, we must put M. Downam to a little more trouble, vrging him to tell vs, in what History he euer read, that Antiochus inuaded the land of Egypt any other then twice, of both which Daniel speaketh from the 22. to the 31. v. declaring how he was put back the second tyme by the Romans; after which he neuer returned into Egypt, and consequently this inuasion of that Countrey, which Daniel speaketh of in this place, cannot in any sort be vnderstood of Antiochus, but must be wholy referred to Antichrist. Finally, if M. Downam will stand to his owne rule of conferring one place of Scripture with another, what can be more plaine then this, that Daniel speaketh now of the same 3. Kingdes, which cap. 7. he said, should be plucked vp, and humiliated by the little horne? Wherfore, whether M. Downams excrements, for so he calleth farre better mens expositions then his owne, be worth the taking vp or no, I leaue to the Readers iudgment, but in my conceipt they sauour very strongly of heresy and folly.

S. Hieroms translation defended.

Antiochus Epiphanes inuaded not Egypt oftener then twice.

14. To Bellarmines Minor, M. Downam is dumbe, as likewise to his confutation of the obiections, which some other

V. VI.

other make against it. And to his third argument he only answereth, that *Lactantius*, *S. Irenæus*, *and S. Hierome are no Scriptures*, as though *Bellarmine* had affirmed, that they were, because in the beginning he saith, that these 4. things are read of Antichrist in the Scriptures. But *M. Downam* might easily haue conceyued, that *Bellarmine* could not proue better that this doctrine is conteyned in the Scripture, then by alleadging the authority of the Fathers, who gather it out of the Scripture: and yet to satisfy *M. Downam* in all points, he alleadgeth also a place of Scripture, where all the 10. Kinges *Apoc.* 17. are said to giue their power to the Beast, that is the Diuell, which the 7. cannot do without yielding themselues to Antichrist after that the other three be slaine. To which *M. Downam* hath nothing to reply, but only asketh, *whether S. Iohn speaketh of Antichrist his either killing 3. or subduing 7?* To which I answere, that *S. Iohn* plainely foretelleth, that all the 10. shall giue their power to the beast, and consequently that the 7. which remaine after the death of the other 3. will concurre with Antichrist, which they cannot do, without yielding themselues vnto him, since it is certayne, that he shalbe the Monarch of the whole world, and because the Scripture is not so expresse, *Bellarmine* only saith, that it may be inferred out of that place, as it may likewise out of the 12. and 13. *Apoc.* as in part hath ben touched. And is it not euident inough of it selfe, that the little horne, which presumed to encounter, if not all the 10. yet at least three of them, while he was so little, will not stay there, when he is growne great, but cause the other 7. to subiect themselues vnto him? The other questions and assertions which *M. Downam* hath, are already confuted, and therefore not to be repeated now againe. Wherefore let vs see, what he saith to the testimonies of *S. Chrysostome* and *S. Cyril*. *I answere* (saith he) *that for substance these Fathers held the truth, for what Monarchi hath there byn in the West these 5. or 6. hundreth yeares besides the Pope &c?* where I beseech the Reader to marke attentiuely *M. Downams* reason, why he alloweth the testimony of the Fathers, which is no other, but because they are against the Pope in some sort, according to his conceipt, for otherwise we may see by that which he answereth

Antichrist shall subdue the Kings which remaine after the 3. and so be shalbe Monarch of the whole world.

Apoc. 17.

Apoc. 12. & 13.

VIII.

Why M. Downam admitteth any of the Fathers.

ſwereth to the 3. former, and that which he ſaith of them all in generall a little before, how little he ſetteth by their authority. Now for the Monarchy of the Weſt, it is euident that it remaineth in the Emperours, and that which he attributeth to the *Pope*, euery child will ſee, how different it is, from the Monarchy of the Romans; and how ſmall a thing it is, if you take away his ſpirituall authoritie, which no doubt is the greateſt vpon earth. But what is that to the temporall power, of which theſe Fathers ſpeake? Now how the Pope is *Lord of the whole earth*, and how he diſpoſeth of the new found world, we ſhall examine at large in the ſecond part, and how the gouernment of *Rome* belongeth not to Antichriſt, in whoſe time it ſhalbe deſtroyed, as neither the 2. beaſt *Apoc.* 13. nor the 7. head *Apoc.* 17. to the Pope hath bin already ſufficiently declared.

The Pope no temporall Monarch.

IX. Antichriſt ſhall perſecute the Chriſtians through the whole world with an innumerable army.

15. To the 4. argument, *M. Downam* anſwereth nothing, which *Bellarmine* himſelf hath not confuted at large in his diſcourſe of *Gog* and *Magog*, which *M. Downam* wholy omitteth, vnder pretext of not troubling his Reader, but indeed, becauſe he would not diſcouer his owne ſhame, for otherwiſe at leaſt he might haue anſwered to ſo much of it, as made againſt himſelf. The like deceipt he vſeth in paſſing ouer *Bellarmines* anſwers, to the Proteſtants obiections, or arguments, wherby they indeauour to proue the Pope Antichriſt; becauſe he ſaw that they contayned in effect an anſwere to his former booke. But I may not omit either, that ſo the Reader may iudge, how well *M. Downam hath cleared them in his former booke*, of which he ſeemeth himſelf to make ſome doubt, by telling vs, *that the controuerſie betwixt vs, is not whether euery argument, that hath bin produced by euery one doth neceſſarily conclude the Pope to be Antichriſt, and that, that diſcourſe is rather perſonall, then reall, and therfore he letteth it paſſe.*

THE

THE SEAVENTENTH CHAPTER.

Of *Gog*, and *Magog*.

11. » WHERFORE the first opinion, or rather errour (saith *Bellarmine*) is of the Iews, who teach that *Gog* is Antichrist, & *Magog* innumerable *Scythian* Nations which lurke within the *Caspian* Mountaynes, and that Antichrist shall come with *Magog*, that is with an Army of *Scythians* at the same tyme, that the *Messias* shall first appeare in *Hierusalem*, and that there shalbe a battaile fought in *Palestina*, and such an ouerthrow in the Army of *Gog*, that for 7. yeares the Iewes shall not cut any wood from trees to make fire withall, but shall burne the speares, bucklers, and other weapons which shalbe found with the dead bodyes, and that afterward there shall be a golden world &c.

11. » *S. Hierome* relateth this opinion *in cap.* 38. *Ezech.* and *Petrus Galatinus lib.* 5. *cap.* 12. *cont. Iudæos*, and *Rabbi Dauid Kimhi* in his Cõmentary vpon the Psalmes in many places; but the Iewes erre in two things. First, that they think the battaile of *Gog* & *Magog*, shalbe in the first comming of Christ, confoũding the first with the second. Wheras notwithstanding the

the Scriptures plainly teach, that Christ in his first cõming, was to come in humility, and as a meeke sheep to be sacrificed, as it is manifest *Isa.* 53. and in other places. Secondly, in that they thinke, that Antichrist shall come against them, and fight with their *Messias*, wheras indeed Antichrist shall be their *Messias*, and shall fight with the Iewes against our Sauiour the true Christ.

The second opinion is of *Lactantius lib. 7. cap.* 24. 25. & 26. who thinketh, that the battaile of *Gog* and *Magog*, shall be a thousand yeares after the death of Antichrist, for he teacheth that after 6000. yeares, from the beginning of the world, Antichrist shall come and raygne three yeares & a halfe, and that then Antichrist shalbe slayne, Christ shall appeare, the Resurrection shall be, and the Saints shall raign heere with Christ vpon earth for a thousand yeares in great peace and tranquillity, the Infidels not being wholy rooted out, but seruing peaceably. Which ended, the Diuell shalbe loosed againe, and a most fierce warre of all Nations be raysed against the same Saints, which they serued for a thousand yeares; and this is the battaile of *Gog* and *Magog*, of which *Ezechiel*, and *S. Iohn* do speake. But that a little after all the wicked shalbe slayne by God, and that then the second Resurrection shall be, and the world be wholy renewed. III.

This opinion was also of many of the ancient Fathers, as *Papias*, *S. Iustine*, *S. Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Apollinaris* and some others, as *S. Hierome* relateth *in cap.* 36. *Ezech.* and *Eusebius lib.* 3. *hist. cap. vlt.* But it is long since exploded as a manifest errour: for our Lord *Matth.* 24 and 25. plainly teacheth, that after the persecution of Antichrist, the last iudgment shall follow forthwith, and that all the good shall go into euerlasting life, and all the euill into euerlasting fire, and therfore that afterward, there shall not be another thousand yeares, nor euer after any more battailes. IV.

The third opinion is of *Eusebius*, who *lib* 9. *demonst. Euang. cap.* 3. thinketh, that *Gog* is the Roman Emperour, and *Magog* his Empire. But he buildeth vpon a false Foundation, for he deduceth this opinion out of *Numb.* 24. where according to the translation of the 70. we read, *the kingdome of Gog* V.

» *shalbe extolled, and his Kingdom shalbe increased: God hath brought him*
» *out of Egypt* &c. where the Scripture seemeth to say, that
» when Christ shall returne out of *Egypt* in his infancy, the
» Kingdome of *Gog* shalbe extolled. But it is manifest, that
» in the infancy of Christ, no Kingdome was extolled, but
» that of the Romans.

VI. But without doubt the edition of the 70. is corrupted in
» this place, for in Hebrew it is not *Gog*, but *Agag, vexarum meagag*
» *malcha: & tolletur propter Agag, vel pro Agag Rex eius.* And his King
» shalbe taken away for *Agag*, or in respect of *Agag*, and the
» sense is according to *S. Hierome in cap. 38. Ezech.* and *Saul*
» the first King of *Israel*, shall be taken away for *Agag*, that
» is, because he shall sinne not killing *Agag*, or according to
» others, *Saul* shalbe extolled before *Agag*, that is, he shall pre-
» uayle and ouercome *Agag*. Both are true. And it is certaine,
» that, that place of *Numer.* is vnderstood of the Kingdome of
» the Iewes, and not of Christ, or the Romans, for it be-
» ginneth: *How faire are thy Tabernacles ô Iacob, thy Tents ô Israel*
» &c.

VII. The fourth opinion is of others, who by *Gog* and
» *Magog* vnderstand the battayles of the Diuell, and his An-
» gells, long since past in Heauen with the good Angells,
» which *S. Hierome* confuteth as destroying the letter in *cap.*
» 38. *Ezechiel*.

VIII. The 5. opinion of *Theodorus Bibliander*, whom *Chytraus*
» followeth in his Commentary vpon *Apoc.* 20. wherfore
» *Bibliander Tab. 14. suæ Chronologiæ*, where he treateth exactly
» of *Gog* and *Magog*, and at length teacheth, that the Prophesy
» of *Ezechiel* and *S. Iohn* perrayneth not to the same tyme, but
» that the Prophesy of *Ezechiel* was fulfilled in the tyme of the
» *Machabees*, and that *Gog* and *Magog* were *Alexander* the Great,
» and his successors the Kinges of *Egypt* and *Syria*, who fought
» many battayles with the Iewes, and were at length ouer-
» come by the *Machabees*, and that the Prophesy of *S. Iohn* was
» fulfilled in the tyme of *Gregory the 7.* and of some ensuing
» Popes, and that the Popes were *Gog* and *Magog*, and the o-
» ther Princes and armyes of Christians, who fought a long
» tyme against the *Sarracens*, for the recouery of the holy Land,
» and our Lords Sepulcher.

The

The first part of this opinion is also of *Theodoretus in cap.* IX.
38. *Ezech.* but it cannot be defended: First because without »
doubt, the Prophesy of *Ezechiel*, and *S. Iohn* is one, and the »
same, and therefore both are to be fulfilled after the com- »
ming of Christ: for first *S. Iohn* saith, that the army of *Gog* »
shall come from the foure corners of the earth, and the same »
saith *Ezechiel*, namely expressing that in the army of *Gog* there »
shalbe *Persians* from the *East*, *Æthiopians* from the *South*, *Tubal* »
that is *Spanyardes* from the *VVest*, and *Togorma*, that is *Phrygians* »
from the coasts of the *North*. Secondly *S. Iohn* saith that »
this army shalbe destroyed by fier sent from *Heauen*: and the »
same affirmeth *Ezechiel* in the end of the 38. Chapter, *I will* »
rayne (saith he) *fier and brimstone vpon him, and his Army*. Final- »
ly *S. Iohn* after this battaile presently addeth the renewing »
of *Ierusalem*, that is the glorification of the Church, and »
likewise *Ezechiel* from *chap.* 40. to the end of his booke trea- »
teth of nothing els, but of the wonderfull renewing of »
Ierusalem. »

Besides, Secondly it is proued, that the Prophesy of X.
Ezechiel was not fulfilled in the tyme of the *Machabees*, for »
Ezech. 38. it is said to *Gog*, *Thou shalt come in the last yeares*, but »
Alexander the Great with his, came in the middle yeares. Like- »
wise *Ezechiel* expresly saith, that in the army of *Gog*, there »
shalbe *Æthiopians*, *Lybians*, *Spaniards*, *Cappadocians* &c. which »
notwithstanding neuer fought against *Ierusalem*, and chiefly »
in the tyme of the *Machabees*, for only the *Syrians*, and the »
Ægyptians fought against the *Machabees*. »

Finally, *Ezechiel* describeth such a victory against *Gog* XI.
and *Magog*, that afterward no enemies were to be feared, »
but all battayles should be ended, but the victory of the *Ma-* »
chabees was not such against the Kinges of *Syria* and *Egypt*, for »
nether the Iewes did euer altogether ouercome the Kinges »
of *Syria* and *Egypt*, and a little after the Iewes were vexed and »
subdued againe by the Romans; neither did they euer de- »
liuer themselues out of their handes, as *S. Augustine* dedu- »
ceth, and proueth *lib.* 18. *de ciuitate Dei cap.* 45. therefore »
the Prophesy of *Ezechiel* was not fulfilled before Christs »
tyme.

The other part of *Billianders* opinion, which is his XII. »

» owne, and peculiar to him, is not only false, but also impious; for first S. Iohn saith, that the battaile of *Gog* and *Magog* shalbe against the Camp of the Saints, and the beloued Citty, that is against Gods true Church. But the warre of the Christians for the recouery of the *Holy Land* was wholy against the *Saracen Mahometans*, vnlesse perhaps *Bibliander* » would haue the *Mahometans* to be the true Church, and camp » of the Saints. Secondly, S. Iohn saith, that there shalbe in » the army of *Gog*, men out of the 4. corners of the earth. But » in the Army of the Christians, there were only out of the » West, and North, that is *French*, *Germans*, *Italians*. Besides » S. Iohn saith, that the warre of *Gog*, and *Magog* being ended, » *Hierusalem* shall forthwith be renewed, and glorified, and » that the Diuell, & Antichrist, and the false Prophets shal- » be throwne into euerlasting fire. But the warre of Christi- » ans for the *Holy Land*, is long since ended, and yet we see » not any *Hierusalem* renewed, nor the Diuell, and the false » Prophets cast into hell, for now, as our Aduersaries also » confesse, the Diuell, and false Prophets most of all flourish.

XIII. » Furthermore, God himselfe by manifest signes, and » wonders, aswell at *Antioch* of *Syria*, as in other places mani- » festly shewed, that, that warre was acceptable vnto him, » of which, see *Guliel. Tyrius lib. 6. de bello sacro*, and *Paulus Æ-* » *milius lib. 4. de rebus Francorum*.

XIIII. » Finally S. *Bernard*, whom *Bibliander* calleth a Saint, *in* » *Chronico*, where he treateth of the tymes of *Eugenius* the 3. be- » sides other holy men, was one of the chiefest Authors of this » warre, for he, both by wordes and myracles perswaded an » infinite multitude of *French*, and *Germans*, to go to that war, » as he himselfe sheweth, *initio lib. 2. de Consid.* and the author » of his life *lib. 2. cap. 4.* writeth, that S. *Bernard* after the bat- » taile was ended, restored a blind man to his sight, in testi- » mony that he had preached that warre in the name of God.

XV. » The 6. opinion is of the *Magdeburgenses*, *cent. 1. lib. 2.* » *cap. 4. column. 435.* where they teach that *Gog* & *Magog*, is » the Kingdome of the *Saracens*, or *Turkes*; which opinion is » wholy opposite to the opinion of *Bibliander*; & therfore it is » better, or rather lesse euill. But yet absolutely it is false; for » *Gog* shall come in the last yeares, and shall not endure long,

as

as it is plainly gathered out of *S. Iohn*, & *Ezechiel*. But the Kingdome of the *Saracens* began long since, and hath endured hitherto, almost a thousand yeares, which doubtlesse cannot be called a little tyme.

The 7. is of *S. Ambrose, lib.* 2. *de fide cap.* vlt. that *Gog* are the *Gothes*, who destroyed many Prouinces of the people of *Rome*. *S. Hierome* maketh mention of this opinion *in quæst. heb. cap.* 10. and saith, *VVhether it be true or no, the end of the warre will shew*. And now doubtlesse, the issue of the war hath taught vs, that it was not true, for neyther hath there followed any renewing of the Church after the warre of the *Gothes*; neither haue all warres ceased. XVI.

The 8. is of *S. Hierome* himselfe *in cap.* 38. *Ezech.* who seeing the difficulty, omitting the litterall sense did mystically expound it of the Heretikes: for he will haue *Gog*, which in Hebrew signifieth the *House top*, to signify the *Heresiarches*, who like to the toppe of an House are lifted vp, and proud; and *Magog* which is interpreted, *of the toppe of an House*, to signify them who beleiue these Arch-heretikes, and are subiect to them, as the House to the roofe or toppe. This opinion taken for the mysticall sense, is most true, but not in the litterall; for *Ezech. cap.* 38. saith: that *Gog* shall come in the last yeares, and *S. Iohn Apoc.* 20. saith, that the same Gog shal come after a thousand yeares, and by the name of a thousand yeares, all Catholickes vnderstand all the time, which is from Christs cōming to Antichrist. Since therfore *Gog* shall not come but about the end of the world, and heresies began in the beginning of the Church, while the Apostles liued, it is manifest, that properly, and litterally, *Gog* doth not signifie the Hereticks. XVII.

We must also know, that *S. Hierome*, when he saith, that *Gog* is interpreted *an house roofe*, and *Mageg*, *of an house roofe*, meaneth not, that Gog and *Magog* in Hebrew are altogether the same, that *An house roofe*, or *of an house roofe* with vs; but he meaneth that it is in a manner the same, for properly an house roofe is not *Gog*, but *Gag*, and of an house roofe, is not *Magog*, but *Miggag*. XVIII.

The 9. opinion is of *S. Augustine lib.* 20. *de ciuitate Dei cap.* 11. who by *Gog* vnderstandeth the Diuell, who is like a great:

„ a great house roofe, that is a great house roofe in which all
„ the euill do dwell; and by *Magog* he vnderstandeth the army
„ of Antichrist gathered of the Nations of the whole world:
„ which opinion doutbles is most true, and to be imbraced,
„ in that it referreth *Gog* and *Magog* to the tymes of Antichrist,
„ aswell, because all Catholike Authors, which write vpon
„ the *Apocalyps* do follow it, as *Arethas*, *Primasius*, *Beda*, *Haymo*,
„ *Rupertus*, *Richardus*, *Anselmus*, and others; as also, because that
„ all which is said by *Ezechiel*, and *S. Iohn*, of *Gog* and *Magog*
„ do most rightly agree to *Antichrist*; for then truly shalbe the
„ last and greatest persecution, and after it shall *Ierusalem* be
„ renewed, that is, the Church glorified: neither shall there
„ any battailes be heard of after. But in that by *Gog* it vnder-
„ standeth the Diuell, it seemeth not true, for *S. Iohn* saith,
„ that the Diuell being let loose, shall call *Gog* and *Magog* to
„ warres, wherefore the Diuell is one thing and *Gog* another.

XX. „ Wherefore our opinion, which is the 10. conteyneth three thinges. First we affirme, that the battaile of *Gog* and
„ *Magog* is the battaile of Antichrist against the Church, as *S.*
„ *Augustine* rightly taught. Secondly, we say, that it is very
„ probable, that by *Gog*, Antichrist himselfe is signified, by
„ *Magog* his army. For *Ezechiel* alway calleth *Gog* a Prince, and
„ *Magog* a Land or Nation. Thirdly, we say that it is proba-
„ ble that *Gog* is so called of *Magog*; and not contrarywise, so
„ that Antichrist is called *Gog* because he is Prince of that Na-
„ tion which is called *Magog*, and that the army of Antichrist
„ is called *Magog* of the *Scythian* Nation, not that it consisteth
„ of those *Scythians*, which the Iewes faygne to be beyond *Cau-*
„ *casus* and the *Caspian* Sea, but either because a great part of
„ Antichrists army shall consist of Barbarous people, which
„ came out of *Scythia*, as *Turkes*, *Tartars*, and the rest, or (which
„ I rather thinke) because it shalbe a very terrible and cruell
„ army, for we call them *Scythians*, which we would call
„ bloudy.

XXI. „ For that *Magog* signifieth the *Scythian* Nation, it is
„ manifest out of *Genes.* 10. where we read that the second
„ sonne of *Iaphet* was called *Magog*, of whome the Country of
„ *Magog* was denominated, which his posterity inhabited,
„ which was *Scythia*, as *Iosephus* teacheth *lib. Antiq. cap.* 11. and

S. Hierome

S. Hierome in quæst. hebr. in Gen. cap. 10. For as from the three sonnes of *Cham*, that is *Chus*, *Myrami*, and *Chanaham*, *Æthiopia* is called *Chus*, *Ægipt Myrami*, and *Palestina Chanaham*; so doubtles *Scythia* is called *Magog* of *Magog* the sonne of *Iaphet*. And that *Ezechiel* naming *Magog*, had relation to the Nation denominated of *Magog* the sonne of *Iaphet*, it is manifest, because in the same place, he addeth as companions to *Gog*, other Nations denominated of other sonnes or nephews of *Iaphet*; as *Gomer*, *Togorma*, *Mosoch*, *Tubal* &c. Wherefore let vs conclude, that the battaile of *Gog* and *Magog* is the last persecution which Antichrist shall raise in the whole world against the Church.

XXII. Neither is it against vs, that *Ezech. cap.* 38. saith, that the weapons of *Gog* and *Magog* shalbe burnt for the space of 7. yeares, wheras notwithstanding it is manifest, that after Antichrists death there shall not be past 45. daies to the end of the world, as is gathered out of *Daniel* 12. for *Ezechiel* speaketh not properly but figuratiuely after the manner of Prophets, neither meaneth he, that indeed those weapons are to be burned for the space of 7. yeares, but that it shalbe so notable an ouerthrow, that the Launces and Targets of the slaine might suffice a very long tyme to make fires, if need were.

XXIII. One doubt remaineth, whether by reason of the most cruell persecution of Antichrist, the Faith and Religion of Christ shalbe altogether extinguished. For *Dominicus Soto in lib. 4. sent. dist. 46. q. 1. art. 1.* thought surely that it would be so. *The departing* (saith he) *and defection from that Sea, shalbe a signe of the cõsummation of the world*. And after. *Faith being extinguished by the departure from that Sea Apostolike, the whole world shalbe vayne, and should without cause continue any longer*. And after. *Let therefore men be astonished, how pestilent self loue is; for thence floweth puffing vp and pryde, which vnder the conduct of Antichrist shall at length consume the Citty of God*.

XXIIII. But this opinion in my iudgment cannot be defended; for first it is repugnant to *S. Augustine*, who *lib. 20. de ciuit. Dei cap* 11. saith: that the Church shall be euer inuincible against Antichrist. *Neyther shall she* (saith he) *forsake her warfare, who is called by the name of Tents*. Secondly, it seemeth

» to me alſo, to be repugnant to the Ghoſpell; for *Matth.* 16. » we read: *Vpon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell* » *ſhall not preuayle againſt her*. But how ſhall they not preuaile, if » they ſhall wholy extinguiſh her? Likewiſe *Matth.* 24. Our » Lord ſaith of the Miniſters of Antichriſt: *They ſhall giue great* » *ſignes, ſo that the elect alſo ſhalbe led into error, if it be poſſible.* Where our » Lord would ſignify, that there ſhall be many elect at that » tyme, who ſhall not ſuffer themſelues to be ſeduced by the » myracles of Antichriſt. Finally, all Wryters, who ſpeake of » Antichriſts perſecution, as *Ezechiel, Daniel, S. Paul, S. Iohn*, & all » the Fathers alleaged before, ſay, that the victory of that war » or perſecution ſhall at length be the Churches. And ſurely, » reaſon it ſelfe teacheth the ſame: For, who can beleeue, that » in that Battaile, in which with their whole Campes, God » and the Diuell, Chriſt and Antichriſt ſhall fight, God ſhal- » be ouercome by the Diuell, and Chriſt by Antichriſt?

M. Dovvnams Anſvvere confuted.

THvs farre *Bellarmine*. In which *M. Downam* is fully confuted. For the reaſons which *Bellarmine* vſeth againſt the firſt part of *Biblianders* opinion, do euidently conuince, that *Ezechiel* ſpeaketh not of the *Seleucida*, nor of their warres againſt the Iewes; and that which *M. Downam* adderh, that *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of the enemyes of the Church, which Sathan incited after he was looſed, is the ſame in effect, which *Bellarmine* affirmeth. For we haue proued before, that Antichriſt ſhalbe in the world, when Sathan is looſed, and not before. Wherfore it remayneth euident, that this Battaile of *Gog* and *Magog* belongeth to Antichriſt, and nor to the Pope, and therfore that the Pope is not Antichriſt, as *M. Downam*, and his Mates moſt impudently & impiouſly dare to affirme.

THE

THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER.

The Dotages of the Heretikes are refuted, with which they do not so much proue, as impudently affirme, that the Pope is Antichrist.

I. ALTHOVGH (saith *Bellarmine*) those things, which we haue hitherto treated of Antichrist, might suffice, since that we haue euidently shewed, that none of those things agree to the Pope, which the diuine Scriptures attribute to Antichrist: yet least any thing should be wanting, and that the impudency of our Aduersaries may be made manifest, I will briefly propose, and confute those arguments which *Luther*, *Libellus Smalcaldicus*, *Caluin*, *Illyricus*, *Tilemanus*, & *Chytraus* bring to proue, that the Pope is Antichrist.

II. And first *Luther*, although euery where he calleth the Pope the chiefest Antichrist, and chiefly in his booke *de captiuitate Babylonica lib. contra execrabilem Bullam Antichristi, in assert. articulorum, lib. cont. Ambros. Catharin.* notwithstanding I could only find one argument of his, with which he endeauoureth to proue it, for *in assert. art. 27.* he speaketh thus: *Daniel* foretold *cap. 8. that Antichrist shall be a King with an impudent face, that is,*

» is, as the Hebrew hath, mighty in sheures, pomps, and cerimonyes of
» outward workes, the spirit of faith in the meane tyme being extingui-
» shed, as we haue seene it fulfilled with so many Religions, Orders, Col-
» leges, Rites, Garments, Habites, Buildings, Constitutions, Rules,
» Obseruances, so that thou canst hardly rehearse the number of their
» names. And these same faces of Antichrist, as he calleth the,
» he recounteth and explicateth at large, lib. cont. Ambros. Cathar.
» de visione Danielis.

III. But this argument of *Luther* hath three faultes. The
» first is in the Foundation it selfe, for the Hebrew wordes
» *sabbagim* verbatim signify *Robustus facie*, and according to the
» Hebrew phrase, *an impudent fellow*, who can not blush: for first
» the 70. translate it ἀναιδὴς προσώπῳ, *Inuerecundus facie*: so
» doth *S. Hierome* translate, so *Theodoretus* readeth, so out of
» the rules of the *Rabbyns* expoundeth it *Franciscus Vatablus*,
» *Fortis facie* (saith he) *is he that blusheth not, and who is no. asha-*
» *med*.

IIII. Finally the same is gathered out of the like wordes
» *Ezech. 3. the house of Israel hath a worne forehead, and an hard hart:*
» *behould I haue giuen thy face more forcible, then their faces, and thy*
» *forehead harder then their foreheads*. Where in the Hebrew it is:
» *The house of Israell haue a strong forehead, and I haue giuen thy face*
» *stronger then their faces*; which haue no other sense, then this,
» as *S. Hierome* rightly expliceth, they are impudent indeed,
» but thou shalt not yeld to their impudency, and if they do
» euill bouldly, and without shame, thou shalt reprehend
» them bouldly, and without shame: which since it is so, let
» *Luther* looke, least he hath an impudent face, if he will pre-
» ferre his owne interpretation, before the *Rabbyns*, *Theodoretus*,
» *S. Hierome*, the 70. Interpreters, and *Ezechiel* himselfe.

V. The second fault of *Luthers* argument is, because it
» cannot be rightly gathered out of this sentence, that the
» Pope is Antichrist (whatsoeuer it signifieth) for though it
» were manifest, that Antichrist shalbe potent in outward
» pompes, and cerimonyes; yet it could not forthwith be
» gathered, that whosoeuer is mighty in outward pompes
» and cerimonyes, is Antichrist, for as the *Logicians* teach,
» nothing is gathered out of particuler affirmatiues: other-
» wise also *Moyses* was Antichrist, who instituted so many
Cerimo-

Cerimonyes in *Exodus* and *Leuiticus*, that they can scarsly be numbred. And when in the same place it is said of *Antiochus*, and in his figure of Antichrist, that he shall vnderstand *Ænigma's* or darke speaches, if *Luthers* argument were good, it would follow, that all they who can solue *Ænigma's*, were Antichrists, which certainely is false and ridiculous.

The third fault is, that he attributeth to the Pope the Institution of all Orders, and Ecclesiasticall Cerimonies, whereas notwithstanding it is manifest, that many of them were not instituted by the Pope, but by other holy Fathers; for the Greeke Church euer had and hath still Monasteries, rites, obseruations, cerimonies which they receaued from *S. Basil*, *S. Paconius*, and other Greeke Fathers, and not from the Bishop of *Rome*. See *Cassianus* his booke *de Institutis renuntiantium*, and *S. Basily Constitutiones*. In the West also, the Orders of *S. Benedict*, *S. Romualdus*, *S. Bruno*, *S. Dominick*, and *S. Francis* were indeed approued by the Pope, but inuented and instituted by those holy men, whome the holy Ghost instructed. So that if these orders belong to Antichrists face, rather those holy Fathers, are to be called Antichrists, then the Pope. VI.

Adde lastly, that the words of *Daniel* agree more fitly to no man (excepting the true Antichrist, who is to be reuealed in his tyme) then to *Luther*; for he aboue all others had an impudent face; for being a Priest, and a Monke, he marryedopenly a Nunne, of which there can be no example giuen in all Antiquity. Likewise he wrote lyes without any number, which are noted and published in wryting by many. *Ioannes Cochlæus in act. Lutheri anno* 1523. wryteth, that out of one of *Luthers* bookes, there were noted by one 50. *lyes*: and that by another, *Luther* was conuinced of 874. *lyes*. Finally, what an impudency was that, when *in lib. cont. Bullam Leonis X.* the same *Luther* durst excommunicate his Bishop, togeather with the whole Church, that adhereth to him? Who euer heard, that a Bishop could be excõmunicated by a Priest? VII.

The Councell of *Chalcedon* in tymes past, trembled at the audaciousnes of *Dioscorus*, who presiding in the second *E-* VIII.

» *Ephesine* Councell, presumed to excommunicate Pope *Leo*. But
» what comparison can there be betwixt *Dioscorus* Patriarch
» of the second Sea, presiding in a generall Councell, and
» *Luther* a simple Monke writing in his chamber? But now
leauing *Luther*, let vs come to *Melanthon*.

THE

THE NINTEENTH CHAPTER.

The trifles of the Smalchaldicall *Synode of the* Lutherans *are confuted.*

I. HERE is a booke of the Power & Primacy of the Pope, or of the Kingdome of Antichrist, put forth in the name of the *Smalchaldicall* Synod; which to me seemeth to be *Melanchons*; but whosoeuers it be, it hath nothing but words, & vayne bragging. *It is well knowne* (saith the Author of the booke) *that the Bishops of Rome with their members defend impious doctrine, and impious worships, and plainly the notes of Antichrist agree to the kingdome of the Pope and his members.* Hitherto the Proposition. Now let vs heare the proofes: for *Paul ad Thessal. describing Antichrist, calleth him the aduersary of Christ, extolling himselfe aboue all that is said, or worshipped for God, sitting in the Temple as God, wherfore he speaketh of some that raigneth in the Church, not of Heathen Kings; and him he calleth the aduersary of Christ; because he shall inuent doctrine repugnant to the Ghospell; and he will vsurpe to himselfe diuine authority.*

II. Although all this if it were true, would hurt vs very little, yet I aske vpon what foundation this exposition is built? *S. Paul* plainly saith, that Antichrist shall extoll himselfe

» selfe aboue euery God, and that he shall sit in the Temple,
» not as a King, not as a Bishop, but plainely as a God; and
» this same expressly affirme *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Ambrose*, and the
» rest of the ancient Fathers interpreters of this place. With
» what right do you then without witnesse and without
» reason affirme, that he is Antichist, who sitteth in the
» Temple, not as a God, but as a Bishop? And is so far from
» extolling himselfe aboue euery God, that he doth not only
» adore God the Father, and the Sonne, and the holy Ghost,
» but also in the presence of all the people prostrateth him-
» selfe before the Sacrament of the Eucharist, before the
» Tombes of the Apostles, and Martyrs, before the Crosse
» and Images of Christ, and his Saintes, which you your
» selues, though impiously, are wont to call strange Gods and
» Idolls? But let vs see how you apply this same to the Pope.

» *The Synode.*

III. » *And first it is manifest that the Pope reigneth in the Church, and*
» *vnder the pretext of Ecclesiasticall authority and Ministry, hath made*
» *himselfe this Kingdome, for he pretended these wordes: I will giue vnto*
» *thee the Keyes.*

» *Bellarmine.*

» You say indeed, that the Pope reigneth in the Church,
» but you proue it not. But we can easily shew the contrary,
» for he, that reigneth, acknowledgeth not any superiour in
» his Kingdome, but the Pope professeth himselfe to be the
» *Vicar*, and Seruant of Christ his King. And although he
» vseth most ample power in the whole House of God, and
» in the vniuersall Kingdome of Christ; notwithstanding
» that power exceedeth not the condition of an administra-
» tor, and seruant: for *Moyses* also (as *S. Paul* saith *Hebr.* 3.)
» was faithfull in the whole house of God, but as a seruant;
» and Christ, as a Sonne in his owne. But to go forward.

» *The Synode.*

IIII. » *Besides, the doctrine of the Pope is many wayes repugnant to the*
» *Ghospell, and vsurpeth to himselfe diuyne authority in three manners. First,*
» *in that he taketh to himselfe authority to change the doctrine of Christ,*
» *and the worships instituted by God: and he will haue his doctrine, and*
» *his worships obserued as if they were diuine.*

This

Bellarmine.

This likewiſe you ſay, but proue it not, and it ſeemeth to vs not only falſe, but alſo a moſt impudent lye, for you are not ignorant, that in the Catholike Church it is taught by all, that the doctrine of Chriſt and worſhips cannot be changed by any man, no nor by any Angell neither. Was there euer any queſtion betwixt you and vs, whether that, which Chriſt taught or commaunded, ought to be beleiued and done; but whether you or we interprete better the doctrine and precepts of Chriſt? In which queſtion you in a manner are wont to bring nothing els, but your owne interpretation; but we bring the conſent of the Fathers, and either the decrees or cuſtomes of the Catholike Church, for we do not oppoſe (as you falſely brag) the conſents of the Fathers, and the decres and cuſtomes of the Church to the word of God, but to your iudgement, and interpretation. But let vs heere the ſecond proofe.

The Synode.

Secondly, becauſe he taketh to himſelfe not only power to looſe and bynd in thu world: but alſo power ouer ſoules after this life. V.

Bellarmine.

This alſo is ſaid, but not proued: for the Pope doth not take to himſelfe authority ouer the ſoules of the departed, ſince that he doth not abſolue them from their ſinnes and puniſhments by his authority, but only communicate with them the prayers and the good workes of the faithfull which lyue, by manner of ſuffrage. And all the ancient Fathers do teach, that the prayers and almes of the liuing, and chiefly the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, do profit the dead, of which ſince we haue largely diſputed els where, it ſhall be ſufficient to haue noted one teſtimony of *S. Auguſtine* in this place: wherefore *ſerm. 34. de verb. Apoſt. S. Auguſtine* ſpeaketh thus: *It is not to be doubted, that the dead are holpen by the prayers of the holy Church, and the wholſome Sacrifice, and the almes which are giuen for their ſoules.* But let vs go on.

The Synode.

Thirdly, becauſe the Pope will not be iudged by the Church, or any other, and taketh away their authority from the iudgment of Coun- VI.

» cells, and of the whole Church. But this is to make himselfe God, to re-
» fuse to be iudged by the Church, or by any other.

Bellarmine.

» Heere also two things are said, which are not pro-
» ued: for first by what Scriptures, by what Councells, by
» what reason do you proue, that the Pope ought to be iud-
» ged by the Councells or the Church? For we read (to omit
» other things which are sufficiently disputed in the former
» booke) that it was said to *S. Peter* by Christ *Iohn* 21. *Feed*
» *my sheep*, and we thinke, that there can be no doubt, that
» the sheep are to be ruled, and iudged by the Sheepheard,
» and not the Sheephard by the sheep. We also read *Luc.* 12.
» that it was said to the same *Peter*: *VVho thinkest thou is a faith-*
» *full and prudent Dispenser, whom the Lord appointeth ouer his family?*
» In which place we see a certain Steward put ouer the whole
» family of Christ, certainly to gouerne it, and not to be go-
» uerned by it.

VII. » And least perhaps some should obiect, what if he
» were a naughty Steward, by whom shall he be iudged, if
» he be aboue all, and subiect to none? Therfore our Lord
» addeth forthwith: *And if that seruant shall say in his hart, my Lord*
» *delayeth to come, and shall begin to strike the Men and Maid-seruants,*
» *and to eate and drinke, and be drunke; the Lord of that seruant will*
» *come in the day which he hopeth not, and in the houre he knoweth not, and*
» *will deuide him, and put his part with Infidels.* Do you heare who is
» the Iudge of the euill Steward whome our Lord hath ap-
» pointed ouer his Family? For Christ saith not, that he shalbe
» iudged by a Councell, but *the Lord will come in the day, which he*
» *hopeth not*, and that which followeth. Wherfore our Lord
» reserueth to himselfe the iudgment of that Seruant, whom
» he hath appointed ouer all his Family, and therfore the
» Pope taketh not away their authority from the iudgment
» of the Councells, and the whole Church, when he suffe-
» reth not himselfe to be iudged by it, for that cānot be taken
» away which was neuer giuen. But neuer did the Coun-
» cells rightly congregated euer take that to themselues, that
» excepting the case of Heresy, they would giue sentence a-
» gainst the Pope. But of this we haue said inough in due
» place.

The

The other thing, which you ſay, and proue not, is, » VIII.
that this is to make himſelfe God, to refuſe to be iudged »
by the Church, or by any other, for when you ſay (*of any*) »
without doubt you meane of any man; for you are not igno- »
rant, that the Pope beliueth and profeſſeth, that he is to »
be iudged by Chriſt. Now, how doth he make himſelfe »
God, who beliueth, that he is to be iudged by God? »

Beſides, certainly the Kings of the earth, do not ac- » IX.
knowledge any Iudge vpon earth, for ſo much as doth be- »
long to politicall affayres, and in your opinion, who take »
coactiue power from Biſhops, they haue not any Iudge euen »
in Eccleſiaſticall matters; ſhall there therfore be ſo many »
Gods as Kings? I do not thinke, that you are ſo mad, as to »
ſay this; wherfore it remayneth that it is not true, that he »
forthwith maketh himſelfe God, who will not be iudged »
by any man. Laſtly you adde. »

The Synode. »

Theſe ſo horrible errours, and this impiety he defendeth with » X.
exceeding great cruelty, and killeth them who diſſent from him. »

Bellarmine. »

Now, how impudently you lye in this place, you »
may know euen by this one inſtance, that I my ſelfe who »
write theſe things, do openly affirme, and that in the City »
of *Rome* (not vnknowne to the Pope) that the Pope may »
not change the doctrine, or worſhips of Chriſt, nor inſti- »
tute new worſhips which ſhould be held for diuine, or »
ſhould any way be repugnant to the Ghoſpell; and yet I am »
not only not killed by him, but neyther receaue any mo- »
leſtation. Becauſe the Pope knoweth very well, that I ſay »
true, & you lye. As alſo a little after, when you adde: *The* »
doctrine of pennance is altogeather depraued by the Pope, and his members; »
for he teacheth, that ſinnes are remitted for the worthines of our works. »
Likewiſe they neuer teach, that ſinnes are freely remitted for Chriſt. »
Which ſurely are not our opinions, but your lyes: for we »
teach not that, but altogeather the contrary, as the Coun- »
cell of *Trent* plainly witneſſeth *Seſſ.* 6. *cap.* 5. 6. 7. & 8. But »
of this inough. I paſſe to *Caluin.*

THE TWENTITH CHAPTER.

Caluins lyes are refuted.

I. WHEREFORE *Iohn Caluin* expounding the place of the Apostle 2. *Thess*. 2. *VVho extolleth himselfe aboue all that is called God*, saith indeed many thinges, and with great pompe of wordes, but he proueth in a manner nothing. *Paul* (saith he) *signified in these wordes, that Antichrist would vsurpe to himselfe those thinges, which are proper to God alone, so that he will extoll himselfe aboue all diuine power and the whole religion, and all the worship of God shall lye vnder his feet.* And after: *Now whosoeuer shalbe taught out of the Scripture what thinges are most proper to God, and on the other side shall behould what the Pope vsurpeth to himselfe, although he be a child of ten yeares old, he will not much labour in the discerning of Antichrist*. Surely a magnificall promise.

II. But let vs heere with what reasons he proueth at length that, which he hath proposed: for peraduenture they wilbe such that children of 10. yeares old will not labour much in soluing them. *The Scripture pronounceth, that God is the only Law-giuer, Isa. 33. v. 22. who can keep, and destroy, Iacob. 4. v. 12. The only King, whose office is to gouerne soules with his word:*

it

it maketh him likewise the author of all holy thinges: it teacheth that »
iustice and saluation is only to be sought for of Christ: it assigneth also the »
manner and meanes. There is none of these thinges which the Pope affir- »
meth not to belong to his power: he glorieth, that it is his office to bind con- »
sciences with what lawes he thinketh good, and to subiect them to eternall »
punishements. He either instituteth new Sacraments at his pleasure, or »
corrupteth and vitiateth, yea wholy abolisheth those which were institu- »
ted by Christ, that he may substitute in their place the sacriledges which »
he hath feygned. He forgeth meanes of obtayning saluation altogether re- »
pugnant to the doctrine of the Ghospell. Finally he doubteth not to change »
the whole Religion at his beck: what I beseech you, is it to extoll himselfe »
aboue all that is reputed God, if the Pope doth it not? »

Did not I say well, that many thinges are said by » III.
Caluin, little or nothing proued? For that the Pope glorieth, »
that it is his office to bind consciences with what lawes he »
thinketh good, that he instituteth new Sacraments, that »
he abolisheth the old, that he forgeth meanes to salua- »
tion repugnant to the doctrine of the Ghospell, that he »
changeth all religion; *Caluin* saith so indeed, but he proueth »
it not. And if to say with him, be to proue; by like reason »
to deny, must be to refute. »

Certaynely all we Catholikes, which obey the Bi- » IIII.
shop of *Rome* Christs Vicar say freely, and without any »
iniury to him, that it is not lawfull for him to bynd men »
with any lawes whatsoeuer, that is, with pernicious also »
and vniust, nor to institute new Sacraments, nor to corrupt »
and abolish those which are instituted by Christ, nor to »
inuent meanes to Saluation repugnant to the doctrine of »
the Ghospell, nor to peruert or change Christian Religion: »
and this we say the more willingly, because we know, »
that he also thinketh and saith so: for if he thinketh not so, »
if he thinketh that he may make vniust lawes, institute »
new Sacraments, abolish the old, and do other thinges »
of that sort; how doth he suffer vs to speake so, who not- »
withstanding are in his power, and not in I know not what »
corner, but teach in the Citty of *Rome* it selfe, by his know- »
ledge and will? »

But they will say, the Pope saith not, that it is law- » V.
full for him to do these things; but yet in very deed, and in »

» fact he ſtriueth, that it is lawfull for him to do them. Let
» it be proued then, that he hath done any of theſe thinges,
» for otherwiſe to aſſume that which is to be proued, which
» indeed is common with our Aduerſaries, is called by the
» Logicians, *petitio principij*.

VI. » Now theſe two places, *Iſa.* 33. and *Iac.* 4. which
» *Caluin* only produceth, are not any thing contrary to our o-
» pinion, for that which *Iſaias*, and *S. Iames* ſay, that our
» King, Iudge, & Law-giuer is one; certainly is not repug-
» nāt to thoſe words, *Prou.* 8. *By me Kings do raigne, and the makers*
» *of Lawes do diſcerne iuſt things*: and with thoſe *Pſal.* 2. *And now*
» *Kings vnderſtand, be inſtructed, you who iudge the earth*, and with
» 600. other of the ſame kind. Wherfore *Iſayas*, and *S. Iames*
» do not make God the only King, Iudge, & Law-giuer in
» whatſoeuer manner; but only in that ſort, that he only is ſo
» King, & Iudge, & Law-giuer, that he ought to giue accoūt
» to none other, that he dependeth of none, that he raigneth
» and iudgeth, and maketh Lawes by his owne authority,
» that is not receaued from another, and finally, that he a-
» lone can alſo with effect deſtroy and ſaue, as *S. Iames* ſaith.
» For we attribute none of theſe things to the Pope, or other
» Princes.

THE

THE XXI.

CHAPTER.

The lyes of Illyricus *are refuted.*

NOw *Illyricus*, in the booke which he wryteth againſt the Popes Primacy, ſaith thus: *But among other arguments, that muſt we hould moſt firmly which hath bene moſt truly and clearly proued by many in this tyme, that the Pope teacheth and defendeth impious Doctrine, and that he is the very Antichriſt himſelfe; the reaſons wherof I will heere repeate. Ioan. 1. epiſt. 2. defineth that Antichriſt is he who denyeth Ieſus to be Chriſt. That the Pope plainly doth, not in words, but in deed. For* Meſchias *in Hebrew, in Greeke* Chriſt, *is a Perſon ſent by God, to be the perpetuall Prieſt and King of the people. It is the office of a Prieſt to teach, pray, and ſacrifice; but it is a Kings office to gouerne and defend.* So he. Now let vs heare, how he proueth, that the Pope hath taken away theſe offices from Chriſt, and what teſtimonies, what reaſons he bringeth. But if I be not deceaued, we ſhall only heare vayne words. Thus then he goeth forward: *Wherfore the Pope taketh away the Prieſthood from Chriſt, for he will not only haue the beloued Sonne heard, but rather himſelfe, and his falſe Apoſtles, who bring another Ghoſpell. Likewiſe becauſe he ſubſtituteth to vs many other Mediatours in Heauen for* Chriſt. F.

» *Chriſt who may make interceſſion for vs before the Father, Chriſt the* » *ſeuere Iudge being neglected. Likewiſe becauſe he hath ſubſtituted infinite* » *petty Sacrificers for Chriſt, who may appeaſe God to mankind, to whom* » *he ſaith, that the Prieſthood was tranſlated from Chriſt by* Peter. » *Finally becauſe, he will haue vs ſaued by the merits of his ſpirituall men* » *and Saintes.*

III. Behould with what cleere teſtimonies of Scripture *Illyricus* conuinceth vs: what if we demonſtrate, that all » theſe are meere lyes? For where I pray you haue you read, » that the Pope had rather haue himſelfe heard then Chriſt? » We deny it: proue it, for we contrary wiſe ſee that the Scri- » ptures are greatly honored by the Pope, and that they are » accompted heretikes who haue taught any thing againſt » the Scriptures. Beſides, is it not a moſt manifeſt lye, that » the Pope hath ſubſtituted Mediators for Chriſt, and that he » would haue them make interceſſion to the Father, Chriſt » being neglected? Do not our *Litanies* begin thus, *Kyrie Eleiſon,* » *Chriſte Eleiſon?* Are not all the praiers of our Church which » we read in the Maſſe and Eccleſiaſtcall office directed to » God, and ended by *Chriſt our Lord*? Doe we not acknowledg » the mediation and interceſſion of Chriſt, ſince that what- » ſoeuer we aske of God, or we deſire to be asked for vs by the » Saintes, we aske it all by the merits of Chriſt? For we » haue not the Saintes in the place of God or Chriſt, but we » deſire of them, that they will ioyne their prayers with ours, » that in this ſort we may obtayne more eaſily of God by » Chriſt whatſoeuer we will haue.

IIII. » In like manner it is a lye, that we ſay, that the Pope » hath ſubſtituted petty Sacrificers for Chriſt, and that the » Preiſthood of Chriſt is tranſlated by *S. Peter* to petty Sacri- » ficers, for you neither proue, neither euer will be able to » proue any of theſe thinges. Neither can there be any doubt, » but that if you had any thing, you would produce it: but » this is it, which we ſay, that Chriſt, who is a Prieſt for » euer, & alway liueth to make interceſſion for vs, hath offred » himſelfe once to God an hoaſt of pacification by his death » of the Croſſe: and that now he offereth himſelfe by the » hands of the Prieſtes againe, and againe in Myſtery.

V. And as, though many baptize in this tyme, notwith-

ſtanding

ſtanding that ſtatue, which we read *Ioan* 1. *This is he who baptizeth in the Holy Ghoſt*: for the office of Chriſt is not tranſlated from Chriſt to Prieſts, but it is he, who alway baptizeth by the Miniſtrie of Prieſts; ſo alſo, though many Prieſtes at this day offer Chriſt in the venerable Myſteries, notwithſtanding he is the principall Prieſt, and truly the chiefeſt Biſhop, who offereth himſelfe by the Miniſtry of all Prieſts. *The workes*, ſaith *S. Chryſoſtome hom.* 83. *in Matth. are not of humane vertue; He that did it then in that ſupper, he worketh now alſo, he finiſheth it, we hould the order of Miniſteries.* XI

But I would willingly learne of thee *Illyricus*, ſince that all the ancyent writers aſwell Greecke, as Latin, make mention of the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, and of Chriſtian Prieſtes, which no man denieth but ſuch as haue not read them; why doeſt thou attribute this only to the Biſhop of *Rome*, that he hath transferred the Prieſthood of Chriſt to petty Sacrificers? but let vs go on to the reſt. VI. X

That which thou addeſt in the laſt place; *he will haue vs ſaued by the merits of his ſpirituall men and Saints*, is only a notable lye; otherwiſe produce a place where the Pope ſaid ſo, for we believe to be ſaued by the grace of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, as alſo our Fathers were ſaued, as *S. Peter* ſaith *Act.* 15. *Neither do we acknowledg any other Saviour, but Ieſus, and him crucified, who gaue himſelfe a redemption for all*, 1. *Tim.* 2. VII.

Now that the merites and prayers of the Saints do profit vs in their manner, cannot be denied, but by him, who knoweth not, or believeth not, that there is communication and connexion betwixt the members of the body of the Church, of which thing ſince we haue treated elſwhere, it ſhall ſuffice to haue added two teſtimonies in this place. Wherefore *S. Aug. quaeſt.* 149. *in Exod.* ſaith thus: *That by that meanes we might be admoniſhed, when our owne merites had oppreſſed vs, ſo that we are not loued of God, that we may be relieued by him, by the merites of them, whome God loueth.* And againe *lib.* 21. *de ciuitate Dei cap.* 17. he diuers tymes repeateth, that ſome obteyne pardon by the merites of Saints; and that this was ſignified by our Lord when he ſaid: *Make you friends of Mammon of iniquity, that when they faile, they may receaue you into euerlaſting Tabernacles, Luc.* 16. *And as we haue alſo experienced,* VIII. IX.

» saith S. Leaſer. 1. de natali. *Apoſtolorum, and our Anceſtors haue*
» *proued, we beleeue and truſt, that we ſhall alway be holped by the prayers*
» *of our ſpirituall Brethren, among all the labours of this life, to obtayne*
» *the mercy of God, that by how much we are depreſſed by our ſinnes, ſo*
» *much we may be erected by Apoſtolicall merits.* So he.

IX. » And although we are not wont to ſpeake ſo, as *Illyricus* ſaith, that we are ſaued by the merits of ſpirituall men:
» yet if any did ſpeake ſo, and would only ſignify, that we
» are in ſome ſort helped by the merites of Saints to obtayne
» ſaluation by Chriſt, he could not be more reprehended
» then the Apoſtles S. *Paul*, who 1. *Cor.* 9. ſaith, *I am made all*
» *things to all men, that I might make all men ſaued*, and the Apoſtle
» S. *Iudas*, who ſpeaketh in like manner, when he ſaith; *Do*
» *you reprehend, theſe indeed being iudged, and ſaue thoſe taking them*
» *from the fier*. And thus much of the Prieſthood of Chriſt.

X. *Illyricus* goeth forward: *Now he taketh away Chriſts King-*
» *dome from him, becauſe in earth he will be the head of the Church, and in*
» *Heauen he appointeth vs other helpers and Sauiours, to whome he com-*
» *maundeth vs to fly in our miſeries: wherefore the Pope denieth that Ieſus*
» *is Chriſt.*

» Heere firſt I aske, whether the Pope or any of the
» Catholikes call the Saints Sauiours? Then I adde, if to
» affirme, that he is the head of the Church vnder Chriſt as
» his Vicar and Miniſter, which the Pope doth, be to deny
» that Ieſus is Chriſt, why by the ſame reaſon whoſoeuer
» affirmeth that he is *Vice-roy*, or Gouernour of ſome Prince,
» is not forthwith cenſured to deny the King to be his
XI. » Lord?

» Finally if to fly to Saints as helpers in miſeries, is to
» deny, that Ieſus is Chriſt, how I pray you did not S. *Paul*
» deny Ieſus to be Chriſt, when he ſaith *Rom.* 15. *I beſeech you*
» *brethren by our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and by the charity of the Holy Ghoſt, that*
» *you helpe me in prayers for me to God, that I may be deliuered from the*
» *infidells which are in Iudaea?* How did not *Baſil* the Great deny
» Ieſus to be Chriſt, when *in orat. de 40. Mart.* he ſpake thus.
» *He that is oppreſſed with any diſtreſſe, let him fly to theſe. Againe, he*
» *that reioyceth let him pray to theſe: he to be deliuered from miſeries,*
» *this other, that he may continue in proſperity?* I omit the reſt of the
» Fathers, for feare leaſt if we examine them, we ſhall find

none.

none, who hath not denied Iesus to be Christ.

Illyricus goeth on. *Dan.* 11. *describeth Antichrist by many notes. First saith he, he shall do what he will, surely the Pope doth what he listeth.* But holy *Daniel*, when he saith of Antichrist he shall do what he will, signifyeth that Antichrist shall acknowledge no superiour at all, no not God himselfe, for so it followeth: *And he shalbe extolled against euery God*: wherefore Antichrist neglecting also the law and commaundement of God, shall liue at his owne will, which certainely the Pope doth not, who denieth not, that he is bound by the law of God, and acknowledgeth Christ his Iudg and Superiour. XII.

He himselfe (saith *Illyricus*) *confesseth it dist.* 40. *If the Pope should draw with him infinite soules into hell, yet no man must say vnto him, what dost thou? And the glosse saith, the Popes will standeth for reason.* XIII.

The *Canon* which beginneth *Si Papa*, is not as *Illyricus* falsly saith, of any Bishop of *Rome*, but of *S. Bonifacе* Bishop of *Mentz* Apostle of the Germanes, and a Martyr: who denieth not, that the chiefe Bishop if he liueth ill is to be rebuked and admonished by brotherly charity: but he denieth, that he can be reprehended by authority and iudged, since that he is the iudge of all men; which *Bonifacе* also in those words, which go before that Canon (as is to be seene in the new edition of the Decree) expresly calleth the Church of *Rome* the head of all Churches, and affirmeth that the prosperity of the whole Church doth depend of the safety of the Bishop of *Rome* after God.

Wherefore I demaund of *Illyricus*, whether the sentence of *S. Bonifacius* Apostle of the *Germans* be true or no, for if it be not true, why is it obiected vnto vs? if it be true, why is it not receaued? I will say the same more plainely. If that sentence be not true, then it is not true that it may not be said to the Pope drawing many soules with himselfe into hell, What doest thou? If it be true, then is the Pope truly the head of all Churches, and being to iudge all, is to be iudged by none. Wherefore let *Illyricus* leaue alleadging the Canons, which can profit him nothing. As for the glosse, let *Illyricus* know, that it is either taken away by XIIII.

» the Pope himselfe, as false in the new edition of the Decree,
» or els was neuer in the decree; certainely I could not find it.

XV. *Illyricus* goeth forward. *Secondly* Daniel *saith that he will exalt himselfe aboue God: that the Pope did, as is manifest by that which hath ben said. Likewise, because he will haue himselfe beard more then God, and blesphemie be set about, that the Scripture is the Fountaine of all heresies and schismes, doubtefull and obscure &c.* But thou shouldest haue rehearsed *Daniels* wordes faithfully, for he saith not, *he will exteol himselfe aboue God; but he shalbe extolled against euery God*; and after: *Neither shall he care for any of the Gods, because he shall rise against all.* Which note most cleerely sheweth that the Pope hath nothing common with Antichrist, for Antichrist will care for none of the Gods; but the Pope worshippeth the only true God, the Father, the Sonne, and holy Ghost. Neither doth he that alone, but also (if we beliue you) he adoreth openly so many Gods, as there be Saintes in Heauen, Images on earth, and reliques vnder the earth.

XVI. Now that which thou addest, *that the Pope crieth out, that the Scripture is the fountaine of heresy and schismes*; Certainely I neuer read it in the writinges of any Pope, but I heare, that it is the word of thy friend *Luther*, that the Scripture is the booke of heretikes, *Luth. præfat. historiæ, quæ contigit in Straßort. anno* 36. which word if it be rightly taken, I see not why it should be deseruedly reprehended; for *S. Hilarie lib. de Synod: extremo*, sheweth that most heresies arose out of the Scriptures ill vnderstood, and *Tertullian in lib. de præscript.* more bouldly saith thus: Neither am I afraid to say, *that the very Scriptures are so disposed by the will of God, that they might minister matter to Heretikes, since I read Heresies must be, which cannot be without Scriptures.*

XVII. And that the Scriptures are ambiguous and obscure in many places, not only the Pope most truly teacheth, but also all the old Fathers, and euen *Luther* himselfe whether he would or no was constreyned to confesse it, when *præfat. in Psal.* he wrote thus: *I would not haue that presumed of me by any which none of the most holy and most learned would yet performe, that is to vnderstand and teach the Psalter in all things with the true and lawfull sense. It is sufficient to haue vnderstood some, and those in part; the spirit*

hath.

hath reserued many thinges to himselfe, that he may alway haue vs his »
schollers, many thinges he only sheweth to intice, many thinges he deliuereth »
to mooue our affections. And after: *I know, that he is most impudently* »
rash, who dareth professe that one booke of the Scripture is vnderstood by »
him in all parts. Also did not the same *Luther in lib. de Concilijs &* »
Ecclesia pag. 52. openly confesse, that he had sought with »
great sweate the true and proper sense of the Scripture? »
Finally so many Translations of the Scripture, so many ex- »
positions, so many most diuers sectes among our aduersaries, »
what other do they proclayme, then that the Scripture is »
ambiguous and obscure? »

Illyricus. »

Thirdly Daniel *saith, that he (Antichrist) shall haue prospe-* XVIII. »
rous successe vntill the anger of God be ended. The Pope hath oppressed as »
he desired by his tyranny and impiety both many common wealths, and also »
innumerable Churches. »

Bellarmine. »

And with what reason, or by what author do you »
proue this? Can you tell, what Common Welthes, what »
Churches the Bishop of *Rome* hath oppressed? what if we cō- »
trarywise demonstrate, that the note altogether opposite »
to this third note of Antichrist, agreeth to the Pope? for »
from that tyme, at which in your opinion the Pope began to »
be Antichrist, his Kingdome hath not only increased, but »
hath alway more, and more decreased. In the time of *S.* »
Leo the Great, that is 150. yeares before Antichrist was »
borne in your opinion, the Pope of *Rome* had more Nations »
vnder him, then the boundes of the *Roman* Empire exten- »
ded to. For so writeth the same *S. Leo serm.* 1. *de natal. Apost.* »
Thou being made, ô Rome, the head of the world by the holy Seat of S. »
Peter, rulest more largely by diuine Religion, then by earthly domination: »
for although increased with many victories thou hast extended the right »
of the Empire by Land and by Sea; yet that is lesse which warlike labour »
hath subdued vnto thee, then that which Christian peace hath subiected. »
And *S. Prosper lib. de ingratis:* »

Sedes Roma Petri, quæ Pastoralis honoris »
Facta caput mundi, quidquid non possidet armis, »
——— Relligione tenet. »

But afterward Antichrist reigning, as you affirme, by » XIX.

» little and little the Roman Sea hath loſt almoſt all *Affrick*,
» the greateſt part of *Aſia*, all *Greece*, and in our tymes in which
» you crie out that Antichriſt rageth moſt of all, all things
» haue ſucceeded ſo proſperouſly, that it hath loſt a great part
» of *Germany*, *Suetia*, *Gothia*, *Norugia*, all *Denmark*, a good part
» of *England*, *France*, *Helvetia*, *Polonia*, *Bohemia*, and *Pannonia*.
» Wherefore, if to haue proſperous ſucceſſe be a note of Anti-
» chriſt, not the Pope, who hath ben depriued of ſo many
» Prouinces, but *Luther*, who by preaching carnall liberty,
» hath ſeduced ſo many people, and hath proceeded with
» ſuch proſperity, that of a priuate Monke he is become the
» Prophet of all *Germany*, and as it were a certaine Pope, may
» deſeruedly be called Antichriſt: but go forward.

» *Illyricus*.

XX. *Fourthly Daniel ſaith, that he will not care for the God of his Fa-*
» *thers, that this is truly ſaid of the Pope, we cleerely proued before in the*
» *place of Iohn.*

» *Bellarmine*.

» And wereproued the ſame more cleerely in the ſame
» place: wherefore go forward to other.

» *Illyricus*.

» *Fifthly he ſaith, that he will not care for the loue of women, which*
XXI. » *the Pope hath done, both by commaunding his followers continency, as*
» *alſo by his Sodomiticall luſtes.*

» *Bellarmine*.

» Heere I omit to ſpeake of your raſhnes, with which
» you dare ſay any thing, little weighing in the meane tyme,
» whether thoſe thinges which you ſay can be proued, or
» not. That I will not omit, that the wordes of *Daniel*, al-
» though in the greeke text, they ſignifie ſo as you ſay, not-
» withſtanding out of the hebrew Fountayne they are tran-
» ſlated by *S. Hierome* into the quite contrary ſenſe, for thus
» he tranſlateth: *And he ſhalbe in the concupiſcence of women*. And
» although the Hebrew wordes *Ve gal kemdath naſim*, only ſi-
» gnifie, *In the concupiſcence of women*, and haue not any word
» a ioyned by which it may be vnderſtood, whether Anti-
» chriſt ſhalbe or not in the concupiſcences of women:
» Notwithſtanding there are two coniectures, which make
the

the translation of *S. Hierome* the more probable.

The one, becauſe it is manifeſt that *Antiochus* of whom litterally *Daniel* ſpeaketh, and who bare the figure of Antichriſt, was very much addicted to the loue of women: *Antiochus* (ſaith *S. Hierome in commentar. huius loci*) *is ſaid to haue bene moſt lecherous, and that he came into ſuch ignominy by rauiſhements, and corruptions of the Kingly Maieſty, that he did alſo publiquely accompany queanes, and harlots, and ſatisfy his luſt in the peoples preſence.* Which ſince it is ſo, how is it credible that *Daniel* would ſay of ſuch a King he ſhall not be *in the concupiſcences of women*? XXII.

The other coniecture is ſince that Antichriſt ſhalbe the *Meſſias* of the *Iewes*, & the Iewes beſides other benefites, expect of their *Meſſias* multitude of wyues, it is in no ſort probable, that Antichriſt ſhall either commaund, or praiſe continency. XXIII.

Laſtly I adde, that if it be a note of Antichriſt, to bring in continency for Prieſts, not only the Pope, but all the ancient Fathers and the Apoſtles themſelues were certaine Antichriſts: for to omit the reſt, which ſhalbe brought in their places, heare what the Fathers of the ſecond Councell of *Carthage* ſay *can.* 2. *It pleaſeth vs all, that Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, or they that handle the Sacraments, keeping chaſtity, abſteine alſo from their wyues, that we may alſo obſerue that, which the Apoſtles taught, and Antiquity it ſelfe hath kept.* Go on. XXIIII.

Illyricus.

Sixtly, Daniel ſaith, that he ſhall worſhip the God Maozim, *and that with gold and ſiluer: which he hath donne while he placeth all piety in this, that many and great Temples fairely built may ſhine with all kind of ornaments, and ſound with ſinging.* XV.

Bellarmine.

Of the God *Maozim* there hath bene much ſaid before, where we ſhewed, that the God *Maozim* is either Antichriſt himſelfe, or the Diuell himſelfe, whom Antichriſt ſhall worſhip ſecretly. But our friend *Illyricus* ſeemeth to me, to make Ieſus Chriſt the God *Maozim*, which ſurely is an intollerable blaſphemy: for that all the Temples, which are coſtly built, and are adorned with gould and ſiluer by the Biſhops of *Rome*, are conſecrated and dedicated to Chriſt our God there is no man but knoweth. Therefore if he, that

is

» is worshipped in these Temples, be the God *Maozim*. Neither did the building and adorning of Temples begin » from the yeare 666. in which yeare our aduersaries will » haue Antichrist to haue appeared, but almost 300. yeares » before this tyme.

XXVI. » Heere *Eusebius ex versione Russini lib. 9. Hist. Eccles. cap.* » *10. By which there was, as it were by Gods gift, ioy infused to all, especially seeing those places, which a little before had bene destroyed by the* » *impious deuises of Tyrants with a new building arise more costly and stately,* » *and the huge Temples were erected insteed of meane meeting places.* » Heere *S. Cyril Hierosol. catech. 14. These Kinges which now are,* » *by their piety couering this holy Church of the Resurrection in which now* » *we are, with siluer and gould, built it vp, and made it resplendent with* » *siluer ornaments.*

XXVII. » See besides, if you list, of the magnificence of Christian Temples, and the splendour of holy Vessells of the » Church *Eusebius lib. 3. & 4. de vita Constantini, S. Greg. Nissen* » *orat. de S. Mart. Theodoro. S. Greg. Nazianz. orat. in Iulian. S.* » *Chrys. hom. 66. ad Pop. Antioch. S. Cyril. Alexand. lib. de rect. fide* » *ad Regin. S. Damas. in vit. S. Siluestri, S. Ambrose lib. 2. de offic.* » *cap. 21. S. Hierom. in commen. cap. 8. Zachar. S. August. in psal. 113.* » *S. Paul. in natal. 3. S. Felicis, Prudentius in hymno de S. Laurentio, &* » *Procop. in lib. de ædificijs Iustiniani.* Certainly all these liued before » the tymes of Antichrist, and yet they witnesse, that there » were such buildinges, and ornaments of Christian Temples euery one in their owne age, that those which we » see now, can in no sort be compared to them.

» *Illyricus.*

XXVIII. *Seauenthly, Daniel saith that Antichrist shall inrich his fellowes:* » *that the Pope hath done.*

» *Bellarmine.*

» Doubteles he greatly inriched *Iohn Eckius, Io. Cochlæus,* » *Io. B. of Rochester, Latomus, Driedon, Tapper, Peter à Soto*, and » so many other most learned men, who hauing laboured » night and daie to suppresse your furies, neuer receaued » one half-penny of the Bishop of *Rome*; although neither did » they desire reward of man, who laboured chiefely for the » glory of God. And if the Bishop of *Rome* giueth rich benefices to *Cardinalls*, and *Bishops*, he is not so much to be thought

to

to enrich them, as the pietie of the faithfull, who gaue these » rents to the Church. »

Illyricus goeth on, *Paul* 2. *Thess.* 2. *putteth* 5. *notes of Anti-* XXIX. *christ besides the afore esaid. The first, that he shall sit in the Temple of* » *God. This the Pope doth, feigning himselfe the Vicar of Christ, and reig-* » *ning in the consciences of men. For if he should professe himselfe the enemy* » *of Christ, as Mahomet doth, he should be out of the Church.* But *S. Paul* » (*Illyricus*) doth not only say, that Antichrist shall sit in the » Temple of God (for euery Bishop sitteth in the Temple of » God) but he explicateth the manner, how he shall sit in the » Temple of God, saying: *shewing himselfe* ὅτι ἐστὶ θεός. But the » Pope by thy owne Testimony maketh himselfe the Vicar » of God, and consequently not God: for the Vicar of God » cannot be God, vnlesse thou feignest lesser, & greater Gods. » Besides, I aske of thee, if the Pope be not out of the » Church, as thou saist in this place, and consequently is » within the Church; where I pray thee, art thou and thine? » art thou not out of the Church? for the Church is one, and » the Pope sitteth in it: wherefore you who are not in that, are » in none. But let vs heare the rest. »

Illyricus. »

The second, because he saith that the mystery was then dooing: this XXX. *I thinke to signify that the Bishop of Rome began a little after to list his* » *head aboue others.* »

Bellarmine. »

This is that, which I briefly noted before, following » *Nicolas Sanders*, who before had seene and written the same, » that in your opinion *S. Peter* is Antichrist, and *Simon Magus*, » or *Nero* Christ. For *S. Paul* saith not the mistery shall worke » a little after, but it worketh now; wherefore if this Mystery » belongeth to the Bishop of *Rome* it must nedes belong to *S.* » *Peter*, and if *S. Peter* (which my hart abhorreth to thinke, » and my hand trembleth to write) was Antichrist, who seeth » not, that *Simon*, and *Nero S. Peters* enemyes were Christ and » God? But keep to thy selfe such Gods and Christs, for we » enuy thee not; but go forward. »

Illyricus. »

The third, because he saith, that Antichrist shall come with lying XXXI. *signes: which the Pope hath donne, as experience witnesseth,* »

" *The fourth, that God shall send the efficacy of illusion: which hath* " *manifestly hapned in the Papacy, for we believed in all things the Pope* " *more firmely, then God.*

XXXII. " We treated before of the miracles of Antichrist *cap.* 15. " and it is a most impudent lye, that *Illyricus* saith of experience; " for the Popes haue done neither true, nor false miracles, " either in this age, or in the former, with which notwith- " standing they say that Antichrist doth chiefly reigne. And " that which he addeth of the efficacy of illusion, euery man " seeth, how easily it may be returned vpon our aduersaryes; " for what greater efficacy of illusion can be imagined, then " that there should some be found in these tymes, who choose " rather to believe two or three Apostataes, then the whole " Church, all Councells, and all the Fathers, who besides " their admirable doctrine and excellent sanctity of life, were " renowned also with many signes and myracles?

XXXIII. " Now that which *Illyricus* bringeth out of *S. Ambrose* to " explicate the fifth note, is before refuted in the second de- " monstration, with which we proued, that Antichrist is " not yet come.

XXXIIII. *Illyricus* in the last place addeth somewhat out of *ep.* 1. *ad Tim.* 4. *In the last tymes some shall depart from the faith: The Pope* " *denieth that there is any other faith but historicall. They shall attend to* " *deceauing spirites: The Pope proueth all things with visions of spirits and* " *soules. They shall prohibite marriage, and the vse of meates: both these* " *are most true and manifest of the Pope.*

XXXV. " But good Syr, the Pope hath learned of *S. Paul*, that " there is one Faith: looke thou from whence thou hast lear- " ned another faith. Besides, *one God* (saith the Apostle *Ephes.* " 4.) *one faith, one baptisme*. Neither did *S. Paul* euer define this " one faith to be a confidence relying vpon the promise and " word of God, as you define it *cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *col.* 262. but he " saith *Rom.* 10. *This is the word of faith which we preach, because if* " *thou confessest in thy mouth one Lord Iesus, and hast believed in thy* " *harte, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saued.* " And *Hebr.* 11. he saith, *by Faith we believe that the worldes were* " *framed by the word of God.*

XXXVI. " And who knoweth not that it pertayneth to the sa- " cred history, that Christ hath ryssen from death, and that

" the

the worldes were framed by the word of God? And yet we name not this one only, and true Faith, by which we moſt certainely beleiue whatſoeuer God hath vouchſafed to reueale by the Apoſtles and Prophets, an hiſtoricall faith; but the Catholike faith, for we leaue to you the nouelties of wordes.

XXXVII. That which thou addeſt, that *the Pope proueth all thinges with the viſions of ſpirites and ſoules*, I know not what ſpirit hath reuealed vnto thee. For we ſomtime bring ſomthing out of the apparitions of ſoules written by approued and ancient authors to confirme thoſe things which belong to the ſtate of ſoules, of which ſort is that which *Euſebius* writeth of the apparition of *S. Potamiena lib. 6. hiſt. Eccleſ. cap. 5.* and that which *S. Auguſtine* relateth of the apparition of *S. Felix Nolanus lib. de cura pro mortuis, cap. 16.* But for the confirmation of other doctrines, I know not what Catholike euer alleaged the viſions of ſoules: but this is not your firſt lye.

XXXVIII. That which thou bringeſt in the laſt place, *of the forbidding of meates and marriages*, is euidently inough confuted by *S. Aug. lib. 30. cont. Fauſt. cap. 6.* where he ſaith thus: *If you were exhorted to Virginity in ſuch ſort, as the Apoſtles doctrine exhorteth; He that giueth to marriage doth well, and he that giueth not to marriage doth well: ſo that you did ſay, Marriage is good, but Virginity better, as the Church doth, which truly is the Church of Chriſt; the holy Ghoſt would not foretell you thus ſaying, forbidding to marry; for he forbiddeth, who ſaith that this is euill, not he who preferreth another thing better before this which is good.* And after: *You ſee therefore, that there is a great difference betwixt thoſe, which exhort to virginity, preferring a greater good before a leſſe, and thoſe which forbidde to marry, vehemently accuſing the act of propagation, which only properly belongeth to marriage. And that there is a great difference betwixt thoſe who abſteyne from meates, for the ſacred ſignification, or for the chaſtiſing of the flesh, and thoſe which abſteyne from meates which God hath created, ſaying; that God hath not created them. VVherefore that is the Prophets and Apoſtles doctrine, this is the doctrine of lying Diuells.* Thus *S. Auguſtine* for himſelfe and vs. Neither is it neceſſary to adde any thing.

XXXIX. *Illyricus concludeth. VVherefore it is manifeſt out of theſe ſignes, that the Pope is that very true Antichriſt himſelfe, of whome*

» *the Scriptures haue prophesied.*

» But perhaps he might haue concluded more fitly in
» this manner: Wherefore it is manifest by these lyes, that
» *Illyricus* is one of his forerunners, whome holy *Daniel* long
» before foretould, that he should haue an impudent
» face.

THE

THE XXII. CHAPTER.

The fooleries of Tilemanus *are refuted.*

TILEMANVS *Heshusius* in the Booke which he intituled, *de sexcentis erroribus Pontificiorum*, whereas he should haue intituled it, *de sexcentis mendacijs Lutheranorum*, made a peculiar title of Antichrist, that is *titul.* 33. and it comprehendeth foure errors. Thus then he saith. I.

Tilemanus. II.

First the Papists say, that Antichrist shall come out of Babylon of the Tribe of Dan. Compendium Theologiæ lib. 7. cap. 8.

Bellarmine.

We thanke *Tilemanus* who teacheth, that so ancient, and so holy Fathers are Papists, for if they be Papists who say, that Antichrist shall come of the Tribe of *Dan*, surely *S. Irenæus, S. Hippolytus, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Prosper, Theodoretus, S. Gregory, Beda, Arethas, Rupertus, Anselmus*, and *Richardus* are Papists. For all these, as we shewed before *cap.* 12. with common consent, do teach that Antichrist shalbe borne of the Tribe of *Dan*. But go on.

Tilemanus. III.

Secondly, the Papists deny, that the Bishop of Rome with his

» *Company is the true Antichrist; whereas it is proued, and demonstrated*
» *with most forcible, and most plaine testimonies of Gods word.*

Bellarmine.

» But we haue not yet seene these testimonies, neither
» are they in any place of our Hebrew, Greeke, or Latin
» Bibles: for the testimonies which are alleadged by your
» brethren, do not so much as name the Bishop of *Rome*.

Tilemanus.

IIII. » *Thirdly, they teach, that Antichrist shall raigne only 3. yeares*
» *and a halfe. Compend. Theologiæ.*

Bellarmine.

» Heere we giue thee immortall thankes, that thou
» confessest, that not only all the ancient Fathers, but also
» the Prophet *Daniel*, and *S. Iohn Euangelist* are Papists; and
» surely I haue compassion of thee, and thine, to whome thou
» only reseruest the dregges of writers, hauing giuen all the
» learned & approued Fathers to the Papists. See, if thou wilt,
» what we taught before *cap.* 8. and thou shalt find, that *S.*
» *Irenæus, S. Hippolytus, S. Cyril, S. Hierome, S. Aug. Theodoretus,*
» *Primasius, Arethas, Beda, Anselmus, Richardus, Rupertus*, and also
» *Daniel* and *S. Iohn* did expressly teach that, which thou af-
» firmest the Papists to teach.

Tilemanus.

V. » *Fourthly, they teach that Antichrist shalbe slaine in the Mount Oli-*
» *uet. Compend. Theol. lib. 7 cap. 4.*

Bellarmine.

» But heere also thou makest great men Papists, for that
» Antichrist was to be slaine in the Mount of *Oliuet S. Hierome*
» *in comment. cap.* 11. *Dan.* gathereth out of *Daniel* himselfe,
» and *Isayas*. *Theodoretus* also writing vpon the same place,
» although he nameth not the mount *Oliuet*, yet he affirmeth,
» that Antichrist is to be killed not far from *Hierusalem*. But
» let vs see now with what arguments thou confutest the
» foresaid errours, for thou addest a preseruatiue immediatly
» in these words.

Tilemanus.

VI. » *The Papists trifles of Antichrist, because they are grounded vpon*
» *no testimony of the holy Scripture, are to be reiected and detested: for*

as

as S. Hierome rightly speaketh, that which hath no authority in the Scripture is contemned with the same facility, with which it is affirmed. And Paul admonisheth that we should take heed of the traditions of men. Coloss. 2. And this I say, least any man deceave you with false reasons &c. Likewise see that no man prey vpon you by Philosophy: we must seeke out of the word of God what is to be thought of Antichrist as 1. Ioan. 2. Who is a lyer, but he that denieth Iesus to be Christ? This is Antichrist. Likewise 2. Thess. 2. the man of sinne, and the sonne of perdition extolleth himselfe aboue euery God &c. Likewise Matth. 24. There shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and they shall giue signes &c. Likewise Dan. 11. and he shall make the munition of the God Maozim &c Likewise Apoc. 17. And I saw a woman drunken with the bould of Saints, and with the bloud of the Martyrs of Iesus. Out of these testimonyes of the sacred Scripture, it appeareth manifestly, what the Christian faith is of Antichrist, whome Christ, and the Apostles foretould was to come. And since it is cleerer then noone-day, that euery one do most exactly agree to the Bishop of Rome, it ought not to be doubted, but that, that most naughty Roman Tyrant is Antichrist. Thus he.

Bellarmine.

VII. It will not be offensiue I trust, if we reduce these thy arguments to the forme of syllogismes, for the more ignorant sort, and conclude thence most euidently the confutation of the aboue written errours. Wherfore the first errour is refuted thus. The Papists trifles, because they are grounded vpon no Testimony of Scripture, are to be reiected, and detested. But the word of God proclaimeth, *who denieth Iesus to be Christ, this is Antichrist*, 1. Io. 2. Wherfore it is an errour to say, that Antichrist shall come of the Tribe of Dan.

VIII. The second errour is thus confuted, as *Hierome* rightly saith, that which hath not authority in the Scripture is contemned with the same facility, with which it is affirmed: but *Paul* saith the man of sinne and the sonne of perdition extolleth himselfe aboue euery God, 2. *Thess.* 2. Therfore the Papists erre, when they deny, that the Pope is Antichrist.

IX. The third thus, and more firmely, because out of two Scriptures *Paul* saith; And this I say, least any man deceaue you

„ you with false reasons &c. *Coloss.* 2. But there shall arise
„ false Christs and false Prophets, and they shall giue signes
„ &c. *Matth.* 24. Therefore the errour of the Papists is intol-
„ lerable, who say, that Antichrist shall raigne three yeares
„ and a halfe.

„ The last thus, and most firmely, because out of three
X. „ Scriptures *Paul* admonisheth, *See that no man prey vpon you by*
„ *Philosophy &c, Coloss.* 2. But Antichrist shall make the muni-
„ tion of the God *Maozim*, *Dan.* 11. and *Iohn* saw a woman
„ drunke with the bloud of the Saintes, *Apoc.* 17. Wherefore
„ the Papists erre exceedingly, when they say, that Anti-
„ christ shalbe slaine in Mount *Oliuet*.

„ The gentle Reader will pardon me, for vsing *Tileman*
„ so ridiculously: for the impudency of the man compelled me,
„ who bringing nothing worth the confutation, yet prateth
„ and boasteth in such sort, as if he had produced Demonstra-
„ tions, more certaine, and more cleere then those, which the
„ *Mathematicians* vse.

THE

THE XXIII. CHAPTER.

The lyes of Chytræus *are refuted.*

DAVID *Chytræus in Comment. cap. 9. Apoc.* » I.
expounding the vision of *S. Iohn*, in »
which when the fifth Angell sounded »
his trumpet, there was an huge starre »
seene to fall from heauen vpō the earth, »
to which was giuen the key of the bot- »
tomeles pitte. And after there was seene »
a most thick smoke to ascend from the »
pitte, which obscured the Sunne, and the ayre. Lastly there »
was seene out of the smoke certaine wonderfull locustes, »
to come forth, which a little after carried the shapes of »
Horses, and Lions, and Scorpions, and armed men: *Chytræus* »
(I say) explicating this vision, thought himselfe, and »
would haue other thinke, that it agreed so fitly to the Bishop »
of *Rome*, that he said; *there is no doubt, but that Antichrist or the* »
order of the Roman Papacy is described in this vision. »

And further he teacheth, that the beginning of this » II.
vision, is to be taken from the yeare 600. and that the starre, »
which fell from Heauen is *Gregory* the Great, Bishop of *Rome*, »
and his successors, who hauing cast away the keys of the »
Kingdome of Heauen, receaued the keyes of the bottome- »

» leſſe pyt, and that the ſmoake comming out of the pyt are
» the corruptions of doctrine, and the diuers traditions of the
» Biſhops of *Rome*. Finally he will haue the ſwarme of Lo-
» cuſts, to be the Biſhops, Clergy, and Monkes &c. and to
» diſſolue this ſmoke in ſome ſort, he propoſed the *Antitheſis* of
» the Popes doctrine, and the Gholpells, or of Antichriſtian,
» or Chriſtian doctrine, which comprehendeth 12. articles
» like another Creed.

III. » But this his opinion may be confuted many wayes;
» firſt, becauſe it is grounded vpon no witnes, for the old in-
» terpreters, as *Arethas*, *Beda*, *Primaſius*, *Anſelmus*, *Rupertus* and
» others vpon this place vnderſtand by that ſtarre, which fell
» from heauen, the Diuell himſelfe, and not any Biſhop; for
» of the Diuell it is ſaid *Iſa.* 14. *How felleſt thou from heauen Luci-*
» *fer, who aroſeſt in the morning*? And becauſe the Diuell fell long
» before *S. Iohn* wrote the Apocalyps, therfore the Fathers
» note, that *S. Iohn* ſaid not, *I ſaw a ſtarre falling from heauen*, but
» *I ſaw a ſtarre fallen from heauen*; for *S. Iohn* ſaw that ſtarre now
» creeping vpon the earth, which in tymes paſt had ſhined
» moſt cleerly in heauen. Alſo, that which followeth agre-
» eth moſt fitly to the Diuell, *And the key of the bottomleſſe pit was*
» *giuen vnto him*; for as Chriſt hath, and cõmunicateth to his
» the keyes of the Kingdome of heauen, and raigneth in the
» mindes of the faithfull and pious: So the Diuell hath the
» keyes of the bottomleſſe pit, and raigneth in the children
» of diffidence, and is often called in the Scriptures, *the Prince*
» *of darkneſſe, the Prince of this world, the God of this world, Ioan.* 12. &
» 14. 2. *Cor.* 4. *Epheſ.* 6. *Coloſ.* 1. and in other places. It is he
» alſo, who by Gods permiſſion raiſeth the ſmoake of errours
» out of the pit, and ſendeth new ſwarmes of Locuſts, that is
» new Arch-heretikes with their armyes, into the lymits of
» the Church, almoſt in euery age.

IV. » Secondly, becauſe *Chytraus* his opinion cannot ſtand
» with that, which *S. Iohn* ſaith in this ſame Chapter of the
» ſixt Angell, and the ſixt perſecution; for *S. Iohn* in 8. and 9.
» *chap. Apoc.* deſcribeth by the trumpets of the 6. Angells, ſix
» perſecutions of heretikes, which were to be from the tyme
» of the Apoſtles, vntill the conſummation of the world. And
» *Chytraus* himſelf by the firſt trumpet, doth not ill vnderſtand
the

the hereſie of the *Ebionits*, which was rayſed in the time of the Apoſtles; by the ſecond, he vnderſtandeth the hereſie of the *Gnoſticks* which followed; by the third, the hereſie of *Samoſatens*, and *Arians*, which was after; by the fourth, the hereſie of *Pelagius* which was latter then they all.

Now, if by the fifth be vnderſtood the perſecution of the Roman Antichriſt, which as they alſo confeſſe, is the laſt perſecution; what ſhall we vnderſtand by the ſixt trumpet? *Chytræus* anſwereth, that by the ſixt trumpet is ſignifyed the perſecution of *Mahomet*, and the Turkes. But this is not well ſaid, both becauſe the Mahometans are not heretikes, but Pagans; and alſo, becauſe the perſecution of Mahomet ſhall not follow, but go before Antichriſts perſecution as we thinke, or they are both togeather, as *Chytræus* ſaith. Wherfore *Chytræus* is compelled to confound the fift trumpet with the ſixt, wheras he referred the reſt plainly inough to diuers tymes: wherfore the Catholikes vnderſtand better by the ſixt trumpet, the perſecution of Antichriſt, which ſhall truly be the laſt, and moſt grieuous, and by the fift ſome very pernicious hereſie, which ſhall go next before the tymes of Antichriſt, which ſurely many very probably coniecture to be the hereſie of the *Lutherans*. V.

Thirdly, becauſe *Chytræus* erreth moſt groſly, when he teacheth, that *S. Gregory* is the falling ſtarre; for *S. Gregory*, if any credit may be giuen to hyſtories, fell not from heauen to earth, but aſcended from earth to heauen; for of a Pretor he became a Monke, and of a Monke a Biſhop: neyther did he euer returne from being a Biſhop to his Pretorſhip, nor from being a Monke to the world. As alſo *S. Baſil*, *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, *S. Chryſoſtome* Grecians; *S. Martin*, *S. Paulinus*, and *S. Auguſtine* Latines of ſecular, became Monkes, and of Monkes Biſhops, neither did euer any ſay, that they did therfore fall from heauen to earth. Beſides, *S. Gregory* was ſecond to none in continency, ſobriety, and loue of heauenly things; and in humility, he in a manner excelled all: and yet *Chytræus* dareth affirme, that he fell from heauen, that is, from an heauenly life to earth, that is, to an earthly and delicate life. VI.

Finally, *Luther* himſelfe *in ſupput. temp.* ſaith, that *S.* VII.

» *Gregory* was an holy Bishop: and *Theodorus Bibliander tab.* 10. » *Chronol.* following *Luther*, praiseth *S. Gregory* exceedingly, » and saith, that it may be knowne by his bookes, how much » he profited in piety and learning. Which doubtles is most » true, for his writinges breath out a wonderfull holynes.

VIII. » Neither is that lesse vaine, which *Chytræus* addeth of » the smoke of the pitte, which he interpreteth the corrup- » tions of doctrine, brought in by *S. Gregory* and his Succes- » sors into the Church. For *S. Gregory* innouated nothing, which » belonged to doctrine, but concerning rites and discipline, » he corrected many thinges, which had crept in by abuse, » many thinges he restored which by negligence of tymes » were forgotten, he instituted a new very few thinges, and » those with mature counsaile, as may be knowne both by » the 4. bookes of his life, written by *Ioannes Diaconus*, as also » by his 63. *epist. lib.* 7. where he giueth accompt of the rites » which he renewed or ordeyned. But this will be most » plaine, if we runne ouer the antithesis or opposition, be- » twixt the doctrine of the Ghospell, and the Pope, which » *Chytræus* proposeth, and to which he often afterward remit- » teth his Readers.

» § I.

» *Of the true Knowledge, and Inuocation of God.*

» *Chytræus.*

IX. » THE Ghospell teacheth, that one only God is to be inuocated and » worshipped, as he hath commaunded himselfe to be worshipped in » his word, and that all the confidence of our saluation, is to be placed in the » only goodnes and mercy of God. The Papists commaund vs not to call v- » pon one only true God, but also vpon dead men or Saints, and to aske and » expect their aide and help in dangers &c. Besides also plainely, after an » heathen manner, they tye the inuocation and worship of God to certaine » Statua's in such sort, as if God were more fauourable, and propitious to him » that calleth vpon him, at this or that Statua, then in other places.

» *Bellarmine.*

X. » Because we haue els where at large treated of these » controuersies which are touched in this antithesis; heere

we

we will only moſt briefly demonſtrate that the doctrine, » which *Chytraus* calleth Popiſh, is neither repugnant to Gods » word, nor began in the tyme of *S. Gregory*. Therefore the » word of God teacheth indeed, that one only God is to be » XI. worſhipped and inuocated with that inuocation, and ado- » ration which is only due to God; for the true God, who is » alſo a zealous God, doth not ſuffer vs to take any creature » for the Creator. In the meane tyme notwithſtanding, the » very ſame word of God biddeth vs honour the more excel- » lent creatures, and inuocate alſo ſome, not as God, but as » deere and familiar freindes to God. As Kinges would be » much offended, if they ſhould ſee Kingly honours giuen » to their ſeruants, who notwithſtanding are well pleaſed, » if they ſee the ſame ſeruants honoured and obſerued. *Adore* (ſaith *Dauid pſal.* 98.) *the footeſtoole of his feete*. And *Iob.* 5. » *Call* (ſaith he) *if there be any man, that may anſwere thee, and turne* » *thy ſelfe to ſome of the Saintes*. Wherefore *Abdias* a great and holy » man adored *Elias* proſtrate vpon the earth 3. *Reg.* 18. And » the children of the Prophets, when they heard, that the » ſpirit of *Elias* had reſted vpon *Elizæus*, comming to him they » adored him proſtrate vpon the earth 4. *Reg.* 2. And the Apo- » ſtle *S. Paul* almoſt in euery Epiſtle, craueth the praiers of » Chriſtians, that by them he may be deliuered from many » dangers. Neither can there any reaſon be giuen, why the » honour due to God is diminiſhed, if we aske of the ſpirits » of Saintes, that they will pray for vs; & it is not diminiſhed, » if we aske the very ſame of the lyuing.

Finally *S. Ambroſe* was 200. yeares elder then *S. Gre-* » XII. *gory*, and yet *lib. de viduis* he ſpeaketh thus: *The Angells are to be* » *beſeeched, who are giuen vs for our defence. The Martyrs are to be be-* » *ſeeched, of whom we ſeeme to challenge a certayne patronage by the pledge* « *of the body*. And after: *Let vs not be aſhamed to take them for inter-* » *ceſſours of our infirmity &c.* »

Moreouer we do not tye the worſhip and inuocation » XIII. to the Statua's of Saintes, to the memories of Martyrs, and » other religious monuments in any other ſort, then God in » times paſt tied them to the ſanctuary or Temple of *Salomon*: » for although God heareth vs euery where, and we may lift » vp our hands to God in euery place, yet not without cauſe »

» the holy Ghost in *Isaias cap.* 56. and Christ in *S. Matth. cap.* 21. called the Temple of God, the House of prayer, nor without cause the most pious Emperour *Theodosius* (to omit many other examples of antiquity) went with the Priests and the people, about all the places of Prayer, lay prostrate in hair-cloth before the shrines of the Martyrs, and the Apostles, and craued assured help by the intercession of Saintes. And certainly *Theodosius*, who did this, & *Russinus* who wrote this *lib.* 2. *hist. Eccles. cap.* 33. were before *S. Gregory* almost 200. yeares.

§. II.

Of the Office and Benefits of Christ.

Chytræus.

XIIII. THE *Ghospell teacheth that remission of sinnes, & eternall saluation is giuen to vs for the only & alone Sõne of God our Lord Iesus Christ crucified for vs, dead, and risen againe, freely, not for any works or merits of ours: And that this is the proper honour of God alone, as it is said, Isa.* 43. *I am, I am he, who taketh away iniquities: likewise there is no saluation in any other. The Papists contrariwise do teach, that we are iustifyed and saued, not for the merits of Christ alone, but partly for Christ, partly for contrition, and obedience.*

Bellarmine.

XV. The Catholike doctrine hath not this: that sinners are iustifyed, partly for Christ, partly for their workes, as though the workes themselues merit any thing without Christ. For we distinguish three kinds of workes, one of those which are done out of the only forces of nature without faith, or the grace of God, and of these we plainly pronounce with the Apostle, that man is not iustified by works but by faith, and if any were iustified by such workes, he should haue glory, but not with God, as *S. Paul* saith of *Abraham, Rom.* 4. wherfore of these workes, there is no controuersie betwixt vs, although euery where with a most impudent lye, you attribute this to vs, that we teach, that workes without the merits of Christ are meritorious.

XVI. Another kiud of workes there is, which proceedeth from

from faith, and the Grace of God, and diſpoſeth to recon- »
ciliation with God, and remiſſion of ſinnes; of which ſort »
are almes, prayers, faſtings, ſorrow for ſinnes and other like; »
which workes we affirme not to be meritorious *ex iuſtitia*, »
of our reconciliation, but rather contrariwiſe we heare the »
Councell of *Trent*, ſaying: *Seſſ. 6. cap.* 8. that men are free- »
ly iuſtifyed, becauſe neyther faith, nor workes which goe »
before iuſtification deſerue it, to wit, of Iuſtice, as though »
iuſtification were due to workes: we confeſſe notwithſtan- »
ding, that theſe workes, as they proceed from Faith, and »
Gods help, are diuine workes, and merit in their manner, »
that is, obtayne by way of requeſt the remiſſion of ſinnes: »
for although you graunt not this, yet the word of God doth »
graunt it: for what is that which *Ezechiel* ſaith *cap.* 18. »
When the impious ſhall turne himſelfe from his impiety, he ſhall quicken »
his ſoule? What is that which *Dan.* ſaith *cap.* 4. *Redeeme thy* »
ſinnes with almes? What is that which *Ionas* ſaith *cap.* 3. *God* »
ſaw their workes (faſtings and hayrecloth) *and tooke compaſſion of* »
them? What is that which Chriſt ſaith, *Luc.* 7. *Many ſinnes are* »
forgiuen her, becauſe ſhe loued much?

And not only *S. Gregory*, but many Fathers before him » XVII.
taught the ſame. *S. Ambroſe lib.* 10. *in Lucam.* *Teares* (ſaith he) »
do not aske, but merit pardon. *S. Hierome lib.* 2. *aduerſ. Pelagianos.* »
They who ſimply confeſſe their ſinnes merit by humility the clemency of our »
Sauiour. *S. Auguſtine epiſt.* 105. *Neither is the remiſſion of ſinnes it* »
ſelfe without ſome merit, if faith obtayne it: for the merit of faith is not »
none, with which faith he ſaid: God be propitious to me a ſinner; and the »
faithfull humbled, deſcended iuſtifyed deſeruedly &c. And *epiſt.* 106. »
If any ſhall ſay, that Faith meriteth grace to worke well, we cannot deny »XVIII.
it, yea we moſt freely confeſſe it.

Finally, the laſt kind of workes is of thoſe, which »
are done by a man already iuſtifyed, and proceed from the »
holy Ghoſt, inhabiting the hart of man, and diffuſing cha- »
rity in it. To which workes, whether you will or no, we »
attribute merit; not with which they merit remiſſion of »
ſinnes which went before, and which cannot properly fall »
vnder merit, but with which they truly and properly me- »
rit glory and euerlaſting bleſſednesſe: for otherwiſe how »
would *S. Paul* ſay 2. *Tim.* 4. *I haue fought a good fight, I haue con-* »

ſummate

» *ſummate my courſe, I haue kept the faith: Concerning the reſt, there is* »
» *layd vp for me a crowne of Iuſtice, which the iuſt Iudge will render me in* »
» *that day.* For if euerlaſting life be not truly the reward of »
» good workes, why calleth he it a Crowne of Iuſtice, and »
» not rather a gift of clemency? Why, ſaith he, is it to be »
» rendred and not giuen? why by a iuſt iudge, not by a libe- »
» rall King? Wherefore rightly *S. Auguſtine ep.* 105. *from whence* »
» (ſaith he) *life euerlaſting it ſelfe, which doubtleſſe in the end ſhall be* »
» *had without faith, and therefore is rendred to precedent merits, yet be-* »
» *cauſe thoſe merites to which it is rendred are not gotten by vs by our ſuffici-* »
» *ency, but are done in vs by grace, it alſo is called grace, and not therefore,* »
» *becauſe it is not giuen to merits, but becauſe the merits alſo of themſelues* »
» *are giuen, to which it is giuen.* »

XIX. » Neither do thoſe two teſtimones of Scripture terrify »
» vs: *I am he who take away iniquities*: and, *there is not ſaluation in* »
» *any other*, for ſuch teſtimonyes exclude another God, another »
» Chriſt, another Sauiour, and Phiſitian of ſoules, who may »
» promiſe ſaluation, the true God, and Chriſt Ieſus being ex- »
» cluded, notwithſtanding they exclude not faith, hope, »
» charity, pennance, Sacraments, with which as it were »
» with certaine meanes and inſtruments God himſelfe chief- »
» ly working the merit of Chriſt is applyed vnto vs, for o- »
» therwiſe how do thoſe ſentences: *I am he, who take away ini-* »
» *quityes*; and, *there is not ſaluation in any other*, agree with thoſe, »
» *Thy faith hath made thee ſafe.* Luc. 7. *He will ſaue thoſe who haue* »
» *hoped in him.* Pſal. 36. *he ſhall quicken his ſoule.* Ezech. 18. *The* »
» *feare of God expelleth ſinne.* Ezech. 1. *He that hath beleiued, and hath* »
» *bene baptized, ſhalbe ſaued.* Marc. vlt. *he that eateth this bread ſhall* »
» *liue for euer.* Ioan. 6. But thus much of this, *Chytræus*. But go »
» forward. »

§. III.

Chytræus.

XX. » THE Ghoſpell teacheth that he who doth pennance, and heareth »
» *the promiſe, ought to beliene the promiſe, and to determine that* »
» *ſinnes are remitted, not only to others, to Peter, or to Paul, but alſo to him-* »
» *ſelfe for Chriſt, that he himſelfe pleaſeth God, is receaued, and heard by* »
» *God; and that we muſt haue acceſſe to God with this faith, and daily in-* »

uocation.

uocation. The Papiſts contende, that we muſt alway doubt, whether we haue remiſſion of ſinnes, which doubtfulnes is ſimply repugnant to faith, and plainely heathen. So he.

Bellarmine.

One Ghoſpell teacheth plainely inough that we muſt giue credit to Gods promiſes, and all Catholikes teach, that we muſt in no ſort doubt of them. But that remiſſion of ſinnes is abſolutely promiſed by God to men, we read in no place of our Ghoſpell. And much leſſe read we, that euery one muſt certainely determine, that his ſinnes are forgiuen him, that he pleaſeth God, and that he is receaued and heard by God. And not without cauſe we read not this becauſe it would deſtroy the reſt, which is moſt plainely and cleerely read in it; for what is more cleere, then that which the wiſe man writeth Eccleſiaſt. 9. *There are iuſt and wiſe, and their workes in the hand of God, and yet a man knoweth not whether he be worthy of hatred or loue?* Likewiſe how manifeſt is that, which *Iob* ſaith *cap.* 9. *Although I ſhalbe ſimple, this very ſame, my ſoule ſhalbe ignorant of?* and after: *I feared all my workes knowing that thou wouldeſt not ſpare the offender?* XXI.

Beſides almoſt all Gods promiſes haue a condition annexed, which no man can certainly know, whether he haue fulfilled it as he ought, or no. *Matt.* 19. *If thou wilt enter into life keep the Comaundemẽts. Luc.* 14. *If any man cõmeth to me, and hateth not Father and Mother, and VVife and Children, and Brethren and Siſters, yea and his owne life beſides, he cannot be my Diſciple. Rom* 8. *The ſpirit himſelfe giueth teſtimony to our ſpirits, that we are the ſonnes of God, and if ſonnes, heyres alſo, heyres truly of God, and coheyres of Chriſt, yet if we ſuffer with him, that we may alſo be gloriſed with him. Finally S. Ambroſe* much more ancient (as we haue ſaid) then *S. Gregory, inſerm.* 5. *ſuper Pſalm.* 118. *Hee would* (ſaith he) *haue his ſhame taken away, which he ſuſpected, either becauſe he had thought in his hart and not done it, and though it were abolished by pennance, yet he ſuſpected leaſt peraduenture his ſhame remayned ſtill, and therefore he prayeth to God to take it away, who only knoweth, that which he himſelfe that did it, may be ignorant of.* XXII.

§. IIII.

Chytræus.

XXIII. THE Ghospell teacheth, that there is one only propitiatory Sacrifice in the world &c. Heb. 7. 10. Christ was once offered that he might take away sinne &c. The Papists teach that Christ is offered euery day in the Sacrifice of the Masse to God the Father by Priests &c.

Bellarmine.

XXIV. The Ghospell teacheth indeed, that there is only one propitiatory Sacrifice in the world, viz. which was once offered vpon the Crosse; neyther do Catholikes deny this; but the Ghospell no where teacheth, that this only Sacrifice may not be euery day reiterated in mystery by the same chiefe B. Christ, by the hands of Priests; and this Catholikes affirme. Neither do they only affirme it, who haue bene since S. Gregories tyme, but all the Fathers togeather, euen those who were many ages before S. Gregory. Heare in the name of the rest, only S. Augustine epist. 23. ad Bonifacium speaking thus: *VVas not Christ offered once in himselfe? and yet in the Sacrament, not only all the solemnityes of Easter, but euery day he is sacrificed, and offered for the people.*

§. V.

Chytræus.

XXV. THE Ghospell teacheth, that not only outward actions repugnant to the law of God, are sinne, but also doubts of God, carnall security, and contumacy, and concupiscence which is borne in vs, and remayneth in those which are borne againe, Rom. 7. The Papists deny, that these euills remayning in those, which are borne againe, are sinnes repugnant to the law of God.

Bellarmine.

XXVI. The Papists, that is Catholikes, teach in no place, that only outward actions are sinnes: but it is lawfull for you to lye; for you learned that of your Father, who stood not in truth. Now, we doubt not, that doubtes of God, carnall security, contumacy, and concupiscence are sinnes,

if

if they be voluntary; but if they be inuoluntary, as thoſe deſires of the fleſh againſt the ſpirit were, which *S. Paul* felt, though he did not conſent vnto them, we conſtantly deny that they are ſinnes. Neyther do we ſtriue with you about *S. Paules* words, as though they ſeemed true to you, and falſe to vs; but about the interpretation of thoſe wordes. Neither muſt you take it ill, if we preferre *S. Auguſtine* and all the Quyre of Saints, before you new Vpſtarts. For thus ſpeaketh *S. Auguſtine lib. 1. cont. duas epiſtolas Pelagianorum. cap. 13. But concerning this concupiſcence of the flesh, I thinke they are deceaued or deceaue with which it is neceſſary, that euen the baptized, and this if he profiteth moſt diligently, and be moued with the ſpirit of God, doth ſtriue with a pious mind. But this although it be called ſinne, it is ſo called, not becauſe it is ſinne, but becauſe it was made by ſinne, as a writing is called a mans hand, becauſe his hand made it.*

§. VI.

Chytræus.

XXVII. THE *Ghoſpell teacheth, that man in his weakneſſe of nature cannot ſatisfy the law of God, and that he is not iuſt and free from all ſinne by this perfect fulfilling of the law, Rom. 8. The ſenſe of the flesh is enmity againſt God, for it obeyeth not the law of God, neyther indeed can it. The Papiſts ſtriue, that man may ſatisfy the law of God, and that he is iuſt, and deſerueth euerlaſting life with this fulfilling of the law.*

Bellarmine.

XXVIII. The Papiſts, that is the children of the Catholike Church, ſay not, that man in this weakneſſe of nature is free from all ſinne, for we acknowledge and profeſſe that it is moſt true which *S. Iohn* ſaith in the beginning of his firſt epiſtle, *If we ſhall ſay, that we haue no ſinne, we ſeduce our ſelues.* But becauſe theſe daily ſinnes neither take away iuſtice, nor are ſo much againſt, as beſides the law, ſince that for the remiſſion of ſuch offences, euery Saint prayeth in opportune tyme, *Pſal.* 31. and all the children of God, doubtleſſe iuſt and holy, are taught daily to ſay, *Forgiue vs our debts, Matth.* 6. Therfore we are not afraid to ſay, that man being iuſtifyed by the grace of God, may by the help of the ſame grace both fulfill the law of God, and by that fulfilling, merit euerla-

» ſting life: for we know who ſaid, *And his Commaundements are not heauy*, 1o. 1. 5. and who likewiſe ſaid: *Call the workmen and render them their reward*, Matth. 20. And againe, *Come you bleſſed of my Father, poſſeſſe the Kingdome prepared for you &c. for I was hungry, and you gaue me to eate.*

XXIX. » Wherefore S. *Auguſtine lib. de gratia & lib. arb. cap.* 16. » *It is certaine* (ſaith he) *that we keep the commaundements, if we will,* » *but becauſe our will is prepared by our Lord, we muſt aske of him, that* » *we may will ſo much, as is ſufficient, that willing we may do.* And *de* » *ſpirit. & lit. cap.* 10. *Grace is therefore giuen, not becauſe we haue ful-* » *filled the law, but that we may fulfill the law.* Neither doth that » word of the Apoſtle mouc vs, *The ſenſe of the fleſh is enmity a-* » *gainſt God:* for the ſame Apoſtle had ſaid before *Rom. 7. There-* » *fore I my ſelfe with my mind ſerue the law of God, but with my fleſh* » *the law of ſinne.* But that which we do with our mynd we » truly do, and that which we do with our fleſh, if the mind » repugneth, is not our deed, as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *If I do* » *that* (ſaith he) *which I will not, now I worke it not.*

» §. VII.

» *Chytræus.*

XXX. » THE *Ghoſpell teacheth that thoſe only are good workes which are* » *commaunded by God &c. according to the rule which I commaund* » *thee, do only theſe thinges for thy Lord, neither adde nor diminiſh. The* » *Papiſts contrariwiſe haue ouerwhelmed the whole Church with tradi-* » *tions &c.*

Bellarmine.

XXXI. » Theſe thinges haue bene already a thouſand tymes re-» peated by you, and refuted by vs. And it is falſe, which » thou ſaieſt, that it is in the Ghoſpell, that thoſe are only » good workes, which God hath commaunded: for where I » pray thee hath God commaunded virginity? Doth not S. » Paul ſay: *But of Virgins I haue not our Lordes precept*, 1. *Cor.* 7? » And yet he ſaith in the ſame place, that it is a good worke » to remayne a *Virgin. Therefore* (ſaith he) *he that ioyneth his virgin* XXXII. » *in Matrimony doth well, and he that ioyneth her not doth better.* » Neither doth that rule much help thee: *Do only thoſe* » *things for the Lord, which I commaund thee.* For God forbiddeth

not

not any other thing in that place, but that we corrupt not his preceptes, but that we keep them entirely as he hath commaunded, not declining to the right hand, nor to the left. Wherefore *S. Aug. lib. de sanct. virginit. cap.* 30. distinguishing precepts from counsailes, *for neither* (saith he) *as it is said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not kill: can it be so, Thou shalt not marry: those thinges are exacted, these are offered. If these be done, they are praised, vnlesse those be done they are condemned. In those God commaundeth vs a debt, in these, if thou shalt supererogate, or bestow any more* (Note) *he will restore it you at his returne.*

§. VIII.

Chytræus.

THE *Ghospell teacheth that both partes of the Sacrament of the Lordes supper are to be ministred to all Christians, and truly of the cuppe he expresly saith, Drinke all of this. The Papists contrariewise determine and define &c.* XXXIII

Bellarmine.

Hitherto we haue not seene that place of the Ghospell, where we are taught that both partes of the Sacrament of our Lords supper are to be ministred to all Christians. For our Lord saith not of the chalyce, Drinke all you Christians of this: but drinke you all of this, and who those all were, *S. Marke* explicated, when he added: *And they dranke all of it*: but all Christians dranke not, but all the Apostles, who only then did eate with our Lord. XXXIV

§. IX.

Chytræus.

THE *Ghospell teacheth that true repentance, or conuersion to God is an earnest sorrow of hart, of sinnes committed, and a faith determining that sinnes are certaynely remitted to him for Christ &c. The Papists contrariewise although they number contrition among the partes of repentance, yet they feigne that it meriteth this remission of sinnes, and they adde auricular confession not commaunded by God and satisfaction or workes not due, with which they feygne, that the eternall paines of sinnes may be satisfied, and that these same works may be redeemed with money.* XXXV

" *All which doctrine is blaſphemous againſt the merit of the Sonne of God,*
" *who alone hath ſatisfyed for our ſinnes.*
" *Bellarmine.*
"

XXXVI. Heere I ſee nothing proued; no teſtimonies of the Ghoſpell produced, but only vayne words interlaced with lyes; for thou mighteſt haue omitted that which thou ſayeſt of conuerſion, and earneſt ſorrow of the hart: for we truly require conuerſion, and earneſt ſorrow of the hart in Penitents, wheras you only haue, I know not what terrours inſteed of contritiō. That which thou addeſt of faith, determining that our ſinnes are forgiuen vs, is refuted before. That which thou ſaieſt, that among the Papiſts, the contrition deſerueth remiſſion of ſinnes, is a lye, before refuted alſo. That alſo, which thou affirmeſt that the Papiſts ſay, that euerlaſting paines are ſatisfyed by temporall ſatisfactions, is likewiſe a lye: for we thinke not that we ſatisfy for euerlaſting paines, which we doubt not to be remitted vs in our iuſtification; but for temporall puniſhments which either heere, or in Purgatory God exacteth of them, who after Baptiſme come to pennance and reconciliation. *The puniſhment* (ſaith *S. Auguſtine tract. 124. in Ioan.*) *endureth longer then the fault; leaſt the fault ſhould be thought ſmall, if the puniſhment were alſo ended with it.*

XXXVII. Finally, that which thou addeſt, that auricular confeſſion is not commaunded, and that ſatisfaction is repugnant to the merit of Chriſt; thou ſaiſt indeed, but doeſt not proue it. Read if thou pleaſe *S. Cyprian ſer. 5. de lapſis*, and thou ſhalt find Confeſſion and Satisfaction to be neceſſary, and theſe very words often repeated. Now that Satisfaction is to be redeemed with money (leaſt peraduenture thou ſhouldeſt ſuſpect ſome vnlawfull negotiation) is nothing elſe among Catholikes, then that one kind of ſatisfaction may be changed into another, by the Prieſts iudgment, as faſting into almes. Let vs go forward to the reſt.

§. X.

Chytraus.

THE *Ghoſpell teacheth, that marriage is graunted, and free for all men, Lay, and Prieſts, and expreſly ſaith, that the forbidding of marriage, and meates is a diuellish doctrine. Contrariwiſe the Papiſts forbid a great part of men, Prieſts, and Monkes marriage, and commeund abſtinence from certaine meates vpon certaine daies.* XXXVIII.

Bellarmine.

But where I pray thee doth the Ghoſpell teach, that marriage is graunted to them who haue a vow of continency? Peraduenture *Hebr.* 13. where we read, *Marriage is honorable in all.* But if (*in all*) comprehendeth all men whatſoeuer, marriage ſhalbe honorable in the Father & the Daughter, in the Mother and the Sonne, in Brother and Siſter; or if this pleaſeth you not, let it not pleaſe you neither, that marriage ought to be called *honourable* betwixt a Monke and a Nunne, and other men for whome it it is not lawfull to marry, by reaſon of their vow, for the Apoſtles meaning only is, that we honour Marriage in all who are duely and lawfully marryed, and it remayneth that you proue, that thoſe are duely and lawfully marryed, who haue vowed to God perpetuall continency. Heare *S. Chryſoſtome* what he wryteth *epiſt.* 6. to *Theodore* a Monke, who meant to marry a wife, or perhaps had already marryed one: *Marriage* (ſaith he) *is honourable, but it is not fitting for thee now to keep the priuiledges of marriage: although thou often calleſt this Marriage, yet I thinke it worſe then adultery.* Concerning the place of the Apoſtle 1. *Tim.* 4. forbidding to marry &c. ſee what we ſaid before *chap.* 21. neere the end of it. XXXIX. XL.

§. XI.

Chytraus.

THE *Ghoſpell teacheth that there is one true, and ſolide ſoundation vpon which the Church of God is built: viz. our Lord Ieſus Chriſt* 1. *Cor.* 3. *Act.* 4. *and Auguſtine ſo interpreteth the place of* XLI.

Matth.

» *Matth. 16. Vpon this rock which thou hast knowne, saying: Thou art*
» *Christ the Sonne of the liuing God, that is vpon my selfe the Sonne of the*
» *liuing God, I will build my Church, I will build thee vpon me, not me*
» *vpon thee. The Pope contrarywise cryeth out, that vpon the rock of the*
» *Roman Church, and the ordinary succession of Popes, all the rest of the*
» *Church in the Christian world is built.*

Bellarmine.

XLII: » But I believe *S. Paul* is not repugnant to himselfe when
» he saith *Ephes. 2. we that are built vpon the foundation of the Apostles*
» *and Prophets.* Neither is *S. Iohn Apoc. 21.* where he saith that
» the 12. Apostles are 12. foundations of the Church, con-
» trary to *S. Paul 1. Cor. 3.* affirming, that there is no other
» Foundation of the Church, but Christ: for *S. Paul 1. Cor. 3.*
» speaketh of the principall foundation. But both he *Ephes. 2.*
» and *S. Io. Apoc. 21.* speake of secondary Foundations. Of
» which manner of foundation *S. Augustine* also speaketh *in*
» *psal. contra part. Donat.* where he saith: *Number the Priests, euen*
» *from the very seat of S. Peter, that is the rock, which the proude gate*
» *of hell do not ouercome.* But of this we haue spoken sufficiently
» before, *lib. 1. de Pontifice cap. 10.*

§. XII.

Chytræus.

XLIII. » THE *Ghospell* teacheth, that *no Apostle or Bishop or other Minister*
» *of the Ghospell, hath superiour, and greater power and rule, then*
» *another, so farre as pertayneth to the Ministry, but that all Ministers haue*
» *equall power to teach the Ghospell, administer Sacraments, bynd wicked,*
» *and absolue those which do pennance, as the Scriptures cleerly teach, Luc.*
» *22. 1. Cor. 3. v. 4. Ioan. 20. & Matth. 18. the keyes of the king-*
» *dome of Heauen are giuen to all the Apostles together. On the contrary*
» *side the Bishop of Rome boasteth, that he hath by Gods law supreme power*
» *ouer all other Bishops, and the whole Church, and both swords, the spiri-*
» *tuall and politick &c.*

Bllarmine.

XLIIII. » I could not yet find, where the Ghospell teacheth,
» that one Bishop or Minister hath not greater power then
» another, for the places which thou citest do plainely signi-
» fy the contrary: for *Luc.* 22. our Lord indeed exhorteth his
disciples

disciples to humility, and forbiddeth Kingly and tyrannicall dominatiō to them, who ought to gouerne the Church. In the meane time notwithstanding he affirmeth, that among the Apostles, one is greater then the rest, yea and the guid or captayne of the rest. For he saith: *let him that is greater among you: become as the lesse, and the precessour* (in Greeke ἡγούμενος, that is *Dux*, the guide or captaine) *as a seruant or Minister*. And the Apostle 1. *Cor.* 3. where he saith, that he had planted, and *Apollo* watred: and againe, that he as the Architect had laid the Foundation, and that others do build vpon it; doth he not plainely inough signify, that he was greater then *Apollo*, and his other coadiutours?

XLV. Moreouer *Io.* 20. it is said indeed to all the Apostles, *Behould I send you*: and *whose sinnes you remit* &c. notwithstanding *cap.* 21. all the Apostles, and the rest of the faithfull are subiected to *S. Peter* as sheep to their Pastour, when it is said by our Lord to *S. Peter* alone in the presence of other Apostles; *feed my sheep*. Finally although *Matth.* 18. it be said to all the Apostles: *Whatsoeuer you shall bind* &c. notwithstanding *Matth.* 16. it is said to *Peter* alone, *To thee I will giue the keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen* &c. and without doubt our Lord would not promise him any thing singulerly, vnlesse also he would giue him some singuler thing: but of these we haue said many thinges before *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. 13. 14.

XLVI. To that which thou obiectest of both the Swordes against the Extrauagant of *Bonifacius* 8. where thou also laugheſt at the Popes arguments: I will only answere in this place, that they are all taken out of *S. Bernard*, whome *Caluin*, *Melanchthon*, and other of your crew are wont to call an holy man, and to alleadge him oftener then once: See *lib.* 2. & 4. *de Consider*: or if thou pleasest, see what we haue treated of this very matter in our last Booke *de Pontifice*. And this shall suffice of thy Antithesis, or opposition in this place.

XLVII. Now it remayneth, that we shew, that this very vision of *S. Iohn* doth best agree to *Luther*, and *Lutherans*: for first it is plaine, that *Luther* may be signifyed by that starre, which fell from heauen to earth, seeing that he became of a religious man, a secular; of a continent, a marryed, and of poore, rich; and changed his sober and slender fare, with

» plentifull and dainty cheere. For what elſe is this, then to
» haue fallen from heauenly to earthly conuerſation?

XLVIII. Now, he that feeleth not the ſmoke of the bottomleſſe pitte which hath enſued vpon his fall, is altogeather
» blind and ſtupide: for before *Luther* fell from the Catholike
» Church, almoſt all the Weſt was of the ſame faith, and re-
» ligion, and whitherſoeuer a man went, he preſently ac-
» knowledged his brethren, for they were all in light. But
» after *Luthers* fall, there aroſe ſuch a ſmoke of Errours, Sects,
» and Schiſmes, that now one cannot know another in the
» ſame Prouince, yea, not in the ſame City or houſe.

XLIX. » This ſmoke hath alſo darkened the Sunne, and the
» Ayre, as it is ſaid in the *Apocalyps*, for both we and our Ad-
» uerſaries do vnderſtand by the Sunne *Chriſt*, and by the Ayre
» the *Scriptures*: by which we after a certaine ſort breath in
» this life. And truly how vehemently this ſmoke hath ob-
» ſcured Chriſt, *Tranſiluania*, and the Countreys therabout do
» teſtify, where Chriſts Diuinity is openly denyed. *Germany*
» alſo witneſſeth, where the *Anabaptiſts* plainly, and the *V-*
» *biquiſts* more obſcurely deny Chriſts Humanity. And though
» there were in tymes paſt many heretikes, which did like-
» wiſe impugne Chriſt, yet none more impudently then the
» heretikes of our time; for many of them doe not only deny
» Chriſt to be God, but they adde, that he cannot be inuoca-
» ted, nor knoweth what we do. It is an horrour to heare or
» read, with what temerity the myſteries of Chriſt are diſ-
» puted of at this tyme.

L. » Likewiſe it is incredible, how vehemently this
» ſmoke hath obſcured the Scriptures, for now there are ſo
» many Tranſlations and Commentaryes contrary one to a-
» nother, that thoſe thinges, which in times paſt were moſt
» cleere, ſeeme now moſt obſcure. What can be ſaid more
» plainly, then that which *S. Paul* ſaith, 1. *Corinth.* 7. *Of Vir-*
» *gins I haue not the precept of our Lord, but I giue counſaile:* And yet
» all the heretikes of this tyme do conſtantly deny, that there
» is any counſaile of Virginity, and that *S. Paul* meant not to
» giue any counſaile to imbrace Virginity in that place, but
» rather to terrify men from it. What can be more plainely
» ſpoken, then that word of our Lord, *This is my Body*: and yet

there

there is nothing more obſcure at this time? What ſhould I ſay of thoſe of *Tranſiluania*, who haue ſo peruerted with their Commentaries the Ghoſpell of *S. Iohn*, which is well knowne to haue bene chiefly written againſt *Cerinthus*, and *Ebion*, who denyed Chriſts Diuinity, that they moſt of all proue out of it, that *Chriſt is not God*?

LI. Let vs come to the Locuſts, which went out of the ſmoke of the pyt. *Chytræus* by the Locuſts vnderſtandeth the Biſhops, Clerkes, and Monkes in the Church before *S. Gregoryes* tyme, and yet theſe wonderfull Locuſts were not yet riſen. But all which *S. Iohn* ſaith of the Locuſts do moſt aptly agree to the *Lutherans*, and the other heretikes of this tyme. For firſt the Locuſts are wont alway to come in great multitude, and to go in flocks *Prou.* 30. the Locuſt hath no King, and they all go out by their ſwarmes: ſo the *Lutherans* properly haue not one Head, becauſe they deny, that there ought to be one Head of the whole Church. Notwithſtanding in a very ſhort tyme they haue increaſed to a huge multitude; neither is it any meruaile, for they haue opened the gate to all vicious men: the gluttons run to them becauſe the Lutherans haue no certaine faſts: the incontinent, becauſe among them all vowes of continency are diſliked, and Monks, Prieſts, & Nũnes are permitted to marry. Likewiſe all Apoſtataes, becauſe among them all Cloyſters are opened, and conuerted into Pallaces; couetous, and ambitious Princes, becauſe both Eccleſiaſticall goods and perſons, are ſubiected to their power; the idle, and the enemies of good workes, becauſe among them, only Faith is ſufficient, good workes are not neceſſary. Finally, all ſinfull and wicked people, becauſe all neceſſity of confeſſing their ſinnes, and giuing account to their owne Paſtour, which is wont to be a very great bridle to ſinners, is taken away among them. Hence therfore are the Locuſts ſo multiplyed,

LII. Now theſe Locuſts are ſtrangely deſcribed by *S. Iohn*, for they are ſaid to haue a mans face, yea a womans, the taile of ſcorpions, the body of Locuſts. Likewiſe they weare vpon their heads a crowne, as it were of gould; they haue the teeth of Lions, and their breſt armed with an iron

» plate. Finally, they seemed to be as horses prepared to the
» warre: and the sound of their winges was heard, as the
» noyse of chariots running to warre, and they had for King
» ouer them an Angell of the bottomelesse pytte, who is
» called an Exterminatour. Their smoth face signifieth the
» beginning of their preaching, which alway beginneth
» from the Ghospell, for they promise to say nothing, but
» the most pure word of God, so they most easily allure the
» simple. The scorpions taile signifieth the poysoned and
» deadly euent, for after they haue proposed the word of God,
» they depraue it with their peruerse interpretation, and in
» that sort as it were writhing their taile, they strike in
» their sting, and infuse their deadly poyson. The Locusts
» body which is in a manner nothing but belly (for the locust
» hath a great belly and therefore it can neither go nor fly
» well, but skippeth a little vp, and presently falleth downe
» to the ground againe) signifieth that the hererikes of this
» tyme are men addicted to their bellies, enemies of fasting
» and continency, and therefore they can neither go by the
» way of the commandements, nor fly to the contemplation
» of heauenly thinges.

LIII. » They indeauour indeed sometyme to erect them-
» selues, and amend their manners, but they presently fall to
» the earth againe like Locusts, of which the *Saxonicall* Visi-
» tation may serue for an example. For when *Luther* cõsidered
» that by reason of the Euangelicall liberty, which he pre-
» ched, and the abrogation of all Ecclesiasticall lawes, the
» people did runne into all vices without a bridle, he ordayn-
» ned a Visitation, and admonished the Pastors, that they
» should preach pennance, the feare of God, obedience, good
» workes &c. but it profited nothing. See *Cochlaus in vita & actis Lutheri, anno* 1527.

LIIII. » In like manner they endeauour to fly by contempla-
» tion, and they write euery where bookes of the *Trinity*, of
» the *Incarnation*, and of such other mysteries; but they fall
» into most grieuous errours, yea most pernicious heresies;
» as is manifest of the *Vbiquists*, who destroy the whole my-
» stery of the *Incarnation*, and *Trinity*.

LV. » The Crownes vpon the heads of the Locusts, signi-

fy

fy the arrogancy and pride, with which they extoll themselues aboue all men. There is a booke of *Luthers*, extant to *Duke George*. In it he saith thus: *From the time of the Apostles no Doctor or Writer, no Deuine or Lawyer hath so notably and cleerely confirmed, instructed, and comforted the consciences of secular States as I haue done. By the singular grace of God I know this certainely, that neither Augustine, nor Ambrose, which notwithstanding are the best in this affayre, are equall to me in this.* What, that not only *Luther* and *Caluin* do set nothing by a 1000. *Cyprians*, and *Augustines*, but also euery paltry Minister accompt all Papists asses, and blocks? Now these Crownes were, as it were of gould, that is, they seemed of gould, but they were not, because they faigne that they are moued to that which they say, with the zeale of Gods honour and charity: whereas notwithstanding, they know nothing lesse then the zeale of God.

The Lions teeth signify the detractions, with which both in writing & speaches they teare the fame of Bishops, Clerkes, Monkes, and of the very Saints themselues which reigne happily with God. And surely they seeme to be nourished with detraction, and they say so many thinges, which neither are, or haue bene, and perhaps shall neuer be, that they seeme to haue cast of all conscience; this is manifest inough aswell by other thinges which are euery where read in their bookes, as by those, which we cited a little before out of the *Smalchaldicall* Synod, *Illyricus*, *Tilemanus*, *Caluin*, and *Chytraeus*. LVI.

The brest armed with an iron plate, signifieth their obstinacy, for they are so obdurate, that though they be most plainely conuinced, yet they neuer yeild, and many tymes they had rather die, then leaue their obstinacy. LVII.

The likenes of horses, which seemed prepared to warre signifieth their bouldnes, and temerity, for they most bouldly prouoke all to warre, whereas notwithstanding afterwards for the most part, they bring only lyes for arguments: *Luther in assertione art. 25. Come hither* (saith he) *all you Papists togeather, ioyne all your studies, if perhaps you can vndoe this knot.* In which manner do almost all the rest speake. Now the similitude of the flying chariots signifieth the swiftnes, LVIII.

„ which this new heresy vseth in taking possession of diuers
„ Countries; for in short tyme it hath not only inuaded many
„ Kingdomes in the North partes, but also durst runne out to
„ the *Indians*, although God permitted not, that it could stay
„ there; for that new and tender Church of Christ, did not
„ deserue so great a scourge.

LIX. „ Finally, the Angell of the bottomelesse pit, is said to
„ be the King of these Locusts: for although the Locusts haue
„ not a visible King, as we said before, yet they cannot want
„ an inuisible King, that is the Diuell, for he is King ouer all
„ the children of Pride, *Iob*. 41. Now, the King of the Lo-
„ custs is called an *Exterminatour*, because the Diuell neuer so
„ destroyed, and wasted the Church by any heresie or perse-
„ cution, as he hath done by the *Lutherans*; for other heresies
„ for the most part destroyed one or two articles, but did not
„ wholy ouerthow the whole order and discipline of the
„ Church. But the *Lutheran* Heresie partly by herselfe, and
„ partly by her offspring the *Anabaptists*, *Caluinists*, *Trinitarians*,
„ *Libertines*, hath destroyed all the good thinges, which the
„ Church had, in the places where it could preuayle, for it
„ hath taken from God the *Trinity* by the new *Samosatenes*,
„ the Deity from Christ by the same men, and his Huma-
„ nity by the *Anabaptists*, from all the Angells and Saintes all
„ worship and inuocation, from Purgatory the suffrages of
„ the liuing, yea it hath exterminated Purgatory it selfe.

LX. „ From the Church which is in earth, it hath taken
„ away many bookes of diuine Scripture, in a manner all
„ Sacraments, all Traditions, the Priesthood, the Sacrifice,
„ Vowes, Fasts, Holy-dayes, Temples, Atars, Reliques, Cros-
„ ses, Images, all Monuments of piety. Likewise all Eccle-
„ siasticall lawes, all discipline, and order.

LXI. But perhaps she hath spared hell, least she should
„ wrong her King the Angell of the bottomlesse pitte. She
„ hath not. For many of the *Lutherans* do also deny the true
„ and locall hell, and feygne I know not what imaginary hell,
„ as we shewed before in the disputation of Ghrists descen-
„ ding into hell. Truely therfore, this may be called an ex-
„ terminating heresie, and worthy of that Captaine, who
„ is called in Hebrew *anaddoch*, in Greeke ἀπολλύων, in

Latin

Latin *Exterminator*. And surely it were a wonder, if the *Lutherans* themselues did not admire this extermination, vnlesse they were altogeather blinded with the smoke of which we spake before.

But amidst so many euills, there is one consolation, that, as *S. Iohn* saith, these Locusts hurt not the greene herbs and trees, but only those men that haue not the signe of the liuing God: for since that this heresie is wholy carnall, it cannot easily deceaue good men, and those in whose minds religion and piety is greene, and doth flourish. So we see, that it hath seldome, or neuer happened, that any hath fallen from the Church to the *Lutherans*, who began not first to be of a corrupt and loose life among Catholiks. But thus much of this. LXII.

THE

THE XXIIII. CHAPTER.

The argumcnts of Caluin, *and* Illyricus *are confuted, who go about to proue that the Pope is no longer a Biſhop; where alſo the fable of* Pope Ioane *the Woman is confuted.*

I. THERE remaineth that which we propounded in the laſt place, *viz.* that we ſhew, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is not only not Antichriſt, but that he hath not loſt his Biſhoprick by any other meanes: for *Caluin* and *Illyricus*, the one with a reaſon, the other with a certaine coniecture, go about to proue that he is not a true Biſhop at this tyme.

II. And to begin with *Caluin*, thus he ſpeaketh *lib. 4. Inſtit. cap. 7. §. 23. & 24. I would know what Epiſcopall thing the Pope hath? Firſt the chiefeſt thing in a Biſhop is to teach the people with the word of God. Another, and next to this, to adminiſter Sacraments: the third, to admonish and exhort, and to correct thoſe who offend, and to conteyne the people in holy diſcipline: what of theſe doth he? Yea, what doth he ſeigne himſelfe to do? Let them ſay therefore, how they will haue him to be accompted a Biſhop, who toucheth not with his leaſt finger, no not ſo much,*

as

as in show, any part of that office. It is not the same of a Bishop and a King: For a King although he doth not that which is proper to a King, notwithstanding he retayneth his honour and title. But in discerning a Bishop Christs commaundement is regarded, which ought alway to be of force in the Church. Wherefore let the Romanists vnty me this knot: I deny that their Pope is Prince of Bishops, since he is no Bishop. So he.

III. If I be not deceaued, all this discourse may be reduced to this short syllogisme. Since this is the difference betwixt a Bishop and a King, that a King is a name of power and gouernment, to which the office of gouerning the people is annexed: but a Bishop is a name of the office only of mynistring the word of God, and the Sacraments. Certainely if neither King nor the Bishop preforme their office, the King shall retaine his name and dignity, and the Bishop shall loose his. But the Bishop of *Rome* doth not performe his office, so much as in shew, since that he neither mynistreth the word of God, nor the Sacraments to the people: wherefore the Pope of *Rome* hath lost his name, and dignity and consequently cannot be called a Bishop.

IIII. Now the *Madgeburgenses centur. 9. cap. 20. col. 500.* go about to confirme the same with a coniecture and signe, for they say that it was an euident signe of the changing of the *Roman* Church into the whore of *Babylon:* that God would, that aboue those tymes, in which this change was made, a certaine true Woman and harlot should sit in the Popish seate, who was called *Iohn* 8.

V. This they proue first, out of the authors *Platina, Martinus Polonus, Sigebertus,* and *Marianus Scotus.* Secondly out of the stepps or signe thereof, which haue remained to our tymes: *viz.* by a certaine seate of Prophyry hollow within, which remayned in the pallace of *S. Io. Lateran,* the vse of which they say was appointed, after the discouery of this cryme, to wit to discerne, whether the new Pope were a man or no. Likewise by a certaine *Statua* of a woman with childe, which hath remayned to our tymes in that place, where *Iohn* 8. is said to haue byn deliuered. Finally, for that the Popes when they go from the *Vatican* to *S. Io. Laterans,* are wont to decline that place, where this woman is said to haue bene deliuered in detestatiō of that fact. For otherwise that

» is the right way: but it is no hard matter to vnty these knots.

VI. » And first to answere to *Calvin*, either he speaketh of
» the signification of the name, or of the thing it selfe, when
» he saith, that a Bishop is a name of an office, a King the name
» of dignitie: if he speaketh of the signification of the name,
» he is plainly deceaued, for as *Episcopus* is deryued of ἐπισκοπῶ,
» that is, of considering, or looking vpon, and signifieth the
» office of looking to, so also *Rex* is deriued of gouerning, in
» latin à *regendo*, and signifieth the office of gouerning, and as
» *Rex* is the name of a Magistrate, so ἐπισκοπος also among the
» Heathens was the name of a Magistrate, *viz.* of the Pretor, as
» is manifest out of *Aristophan in auibus*; and that which is more,
» the same name of Pastor in the Scripture, is attributed to a
» Bishop, and a King, as is manifest *Ephes.* 4. & *Isa.* 44.

VII. » And if he speaketh of the thing it selfe, he is no lesse
» deceaued, for as Kingly office is not a simple office of iudg-
» ging, as of other Iudges, but a true Prefecture in politicall
» affayres, that is a power of gouerning men that are subiect
» to him, by cõmaunding & punishing: so also a Bishoprick
» is not a simple office of preaching, as it is of many other,
» who preach and are not Pastors: but it it a true Ecclesiastical
» Prefecture, that is a power to gouerne men in spirituall, &
» diuine affayres, and consequently of cõmaunding & puni-
» shing, of which we haue said much already, and yet will say
» more in the booke following. Now it shall suffice to note a
» few, but most cleere places. The Apostle *S. Paul* 1. *Cor.* 11.
» saith: *I will dispose the rest when I come.* and 2. *Cor.* 13. *that I deale*
» *not more seuerely according to the power which our Lord hath giuen me.*
» and *Heb.* 13. *obey your Superiours, & be subiect vnto them.* and 1. *Tim.*
» 5. *Receaue not accusatiõ against a Priest, but vnder* 2. *or* 3. *Witnesses.*

VIII. » Adde to this also, that it is false, the Popes performe
» not the Episcopal function; for they are not boũd to preach,
» and minister Sacraments themselues, if they be hindred by
» some iust cause; but it is sufficient if they procure, that all
» this be done by others; otherwise Bishops should be bound
» to impossibilityes, for there is no Bishop so little, who can
» be sufficient of himselfe to preach & minister Sacraments in
» all his Diocesse. As therfore he satisfieth, if in that place
» where he cannot himselfe, he preacheth by another; so like-

wise

wise he satisfieth, if in all places he preacheth by another, when he cannot do it himselfe in any. Neyther want there examples of antiquity: for *Possidius* writeth in the life of *S. Augustine*, that *S. Valerius* Bishop of *Hippo* committed the office of preaching to *S. Augustine* his Priest, because he being a Grecian could not preach himselfe to a Latin people: and in the same place *Possidius* relateth, that in the East Church, many *Bishops* were wont to cõmit the office of Preaching to their Priests, which they could not exercise themselues. And yet we cãnot say, that eyther *S. Valerius* or others, who preached not the word of God themselues, were not Bishops.

To the argument of the *Magdeburgians*, I say, that their history of Pope *Iohn* the Woman is a fable, which *Onuphrius* refuteth sufficiently in his addition to *Platina*. And first it is conuinced to be a fable by the testimonie of Greek & Latin Wryters. The first of all, who could wryte of this thing, and who best knew it, was *Athanasius Bibliothec.* who liued in that very time, in which this *Iohn* 8. is feigned to haue bene Pope, *viz.* about the yeare 850. & was present at the creation of many Popes, who eyther were before or followed this *Iohn*. Heerefore writeth that after *Leo* 4. the Sea was vacãt 15. daies, and presently by common consent *Benedictus* 3. was created: by which words he sheweth, that there was no *Iohn* a woman, for all that admit this *Iohn*, do say, that he sate after *Leo* the 4. and before *Benedictus* 3. and that he liued in the Popedome two yeares, and 15. moneths. IX.

They will say perhaps, that *Anastasius* omitteth this *Iohn* 8. in fauour of the Popes. But against this, at the least-wise, he should haue said, that the Sea was vacant after *Leo* 4. two yeares and a halfe, least he should admit a manifest errour in his *Chronology*, and an errour which might be refuted by eye witnesses who liued then. They answere, that there is no errour in the *Chronology*, because these two yeares of *Iohn* are added to *Leo* 4. for *Leo* 4. is said by *Anastasius* to haue sitten 8. yeares, which are so to be taken, that 6. yeares are of *Leo* himselfe, and other two are added out of the yeares of *Iohn* the woman. X.

But against this, is, that not only *Anastasius* but also *Martinus Polonus*, and *Platina*, and the *Magdeburgians*, and *Bibliander*, XI.

» and others, who will haue *Io.* 8. to haue sitten two yeares,
» giue 8. yeares to *Leo*. Wherefore there wilbe perforce an er-
» rour in the Chronology of *Anastasius*, if this *Iohn* be put Pope
» after *Leo*. Besides not only *Anastasius*, but also *Ado* Bishop of
» *Vienna*, who liued at the same tyme, and of whome there is
» no suspition that he would lye in fauour of the Popes, tea-
» cheth, that there was no *Iohn* betwixt *Leo* 4. and *Benedictus* 3.
» for thus he speaketh in the Cronicle of the yeare 865. *Gregory*
» *the Bishop of Rome dieth, and Sergius is ordayned in his place: he being*
» *dead* Leo *succeedeth, who dying Benedictus is substituted in the Apostoli-*
» *call Sea*. And in the like sort speake *Rhegino*, *Lambertus*, *Herma-*
» *nus Contractus*, *Abbas Vrspergensis*, *Otho Frisingensis*, and all other
» Historiographers, which are very many, vntill *Martinus Po-*
» *lonus* who was 400. yeares after this feygned *Io.* 8. and he
» first mentioned this *Iohn* 8. against the testimony of all the
» ancient, and from him did *Platina* and the other later take it.

XII. » And not only the *Latins*, but also the Greekes, who
» wrote before *Martinus Polonus*, as *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, *Ioannes Cu-*
» *ropalates*, and others make no mention of this prodigious hi-
» story among the thinges of that tyme, whereas notwith-
» standing they fauour not the Bishop of *Rome*, and would wil-
» lingly haue taken an occasion to scoffe at the Latines in this
» respect, if they might. Now how is it credible, that *Marti-*
» *nus Polonus* who liued in the yeare 1250. knew better, what
» passed about the yeare 850. then all other Historiographers
» who liued in the yeare 800. or 900. or 1000?

XIII. » And that, which the *Magdeburgians* say, that *Sigebert*,
» and *Marianus Scotus*, who are more ancient then *Martinus Polo-*
» *nus*, did put *Iohn* the Woman in their Chronicles, is false. Al-
» though in the printed *Sigebert*, and *Marianus Scotus*, *Iohn* the
» Woman is found; yet in the most ancient manuscripts she is
» not found, and it is sufficiently knowne, that those authors
» are corrupted. There is yet extant in the Monastery of *Gem-*
» *blacum*, where *Sigebert* was monke, a most ancient manu-
» script copy, which is thought to be *Sigeberts* owne, and in it
» there is no mention of *Iohn* the Woman, which manuscript
» copy *Iohn Molanus* a Doctor of *Louayne*, who is yet aliue, wit-
» nesseth, that he hath seene. Likewise that in the most an-
» cient copyes of *Marianus Scotus*, *Iohn* the Woman is not to be
found

found, he witnesseth who put forth the *Metropolis* of *Albertus* » *Krantzius*, at *Colen*, in the yeare 1574. »

Secondly that this narration of *Martinus* concerning » XIIII.
Iohn the *VVoman* is a fable, is proued out of the narration it » selfe: for first he saith, that this *Iohn* was an English Woman » of *Meuze*: but *Mentz* is not in *England*, but in *Germany*. And » others to amend this errour are strangly repugnant one to » the other: for *Platina* saith, that she was an English Woman, » but come out of *Mentz*. The *Magdeburgians* contrarywise say, » that she was of *Mentz*, but come out of *England*. But *Theodorus* » *Bibliander* in his chronicle saith that she was neither borne, » nor come out of *England*, but brought vp and instructed in » *England*.

Secondly *Martin*, and those which follow him say, » XV.
that she studied at *Athens*. But it is manifest, that in that »
tyme, there were no Schooles, neither at *Athens*, nor in any »
other place of *Greece*, for *Synesius* writeth *in epist. vlt. ad Fratrẽ* »
suum, that in his tyme there was nothing but the name of »
an Academie at *Athens*. And *Synesius* was a little after the »
tymes of *S. Basil*, and *S. Nazianzen*. *Cedrenus* also, and *Zonaras* »
do write *in vita Michaelis, & Theodoræ Impp.* that about the »
end of *Michaels* raigne, *viz.* when he raigned alone, his »
mother *Theodora* being remoued, the Schooles of learning »
and Philosophy were restored by *Bardas Cæsar*; whereas vn- »
till that tyme, for many yeares, all studies of wisdome were »
so extinguished in *Greece*, that there was not so much as any »
step or signe of them extant. Now it is manifest, that the »
Empyre of *Michael* alone, *Theodora* being remoued, fell in the »
tyme of *Nicolas* the 1. who succeeded *Benedictus* 3. who had »
succeeded as these men feigne *Iohn* 8. the Woman: yea all »
Chronologies, and *Bibliander* himselfe put the beginning of the »
Empire of *Michael* alone in the yeare 856. and the Popedome »
of *Iohn* the Woman in the yeare 854. By which it followeth, »
that the studies of wisdome, began to be reuiued in *Greece* »
after the death of this *Iohn*, » XVI.

Thirdly the *Magdeburgians* say, that this *Io.* 8. was deliue- »
red in his iourney when he would haue visited the *Lateran* »
Church, from the *Vatican*. But it is most certaine, as *Onuphrius* »
demonstrateth *lib. de 7. Eccl.* that the B. of *Rome* did not dwell »

„ in the *Vatican*, but in the *Lateran* Pallace, vntill the time
„ of *Bonifacius* the 9. that is, vntill the yeare 1309. how then if
„ she dwelt in the *Lateran*, would she go from the *Vatican* to
„ visit the *Lateran*? Certainly if one should wryte now, that
„ the Pope came from the *Lateran* to visit the *Vatican* Church,
„ he would be ridiculous, since all know that the Pope dwel-
„ leth in the *Vatican*.

XVII. „ Fourthly *Martin*, and all the rest say, that this *Iohn* was
„ deliuered in a solemne and publike Procession. But certain-
„ ly there is no probability, that a woman gone with child
„ so many moneths, would then chiefly goe in Procession,
„ when she was in most danger to be discouered.

XVIII. „ Thirdly this is proued out of the *epist.* of *Leo* 9. a most
„ graue pope, to *Michael* Bishop of *Constantinople cap.* 23. where
„ Pope *Leo* writeth, that it is a constant fame, that many Eu-
„ nuches had sitten in the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, & that
„ among them there had crept in, and bene Patriarch a Wo-
„ man; which certainly *Leo* would neuer haue obiected to
„ the *Grecians*, if any such thing had happened a little before
„ to the Roman Sea: yea perhaps from hence arose this fable
„ of *Iohn* the Woman: for wheras there was a rumour, that a
„ certaine woman had bene Bishop of *Constantinople*, and after
„ by little and little, the name of *Constantinople* being omitted,
„ there remayned the fame and opinion of a woman Bishop,
„ and Vniuersall Bishop; some began in hatred of the Roman
„ Church to say, that that woman had bene Bishop of *Rome*.
„ And it is very like, that this fame arose about the tyme of
„ *Martin* himselfe. Certainly *Martinus Polonus*, who first wrote
„ it, bringeth no Author, but only said: *It is reported*: wher-
„ fore he only had it by an vncertaine rumour.

XIX. „ Neither ought it to seeme strange, if some feigned
„ this fable in hatred of the Church of *Rome*, that ground of a
„ woman being Bishop supposed, and there being so many
„ contentions at that tyme betwixt those which fauoured the
„ Emperours, and others which fauoured the Popes; for now
„ also we see, that the *Magdeburgians* do feigne more incredible
„ things; for wheras *Martin* only wrote, that this was an En-
„ glish woman of *Mentz*, and added nothing of the Parents &
„ proper name of the woman, and other things; the *Magde-*

burgians

burgians haue added, that the Father of this woman was an English Priest, and that she in the beginning was called *Gilbert*, and that she was brought vp in the habite of a man, in the Monastery of *Fulda*, and that she wrote bookes of witchcraft; which are all meere fancies inuented without witnesse or reason. Adde, that this *Martinus Polonus* seemeth to haue bene a most simple man, for he writeth many other fables, as though they were most authenticall hystories.

XX. Now, that which they obiect of the hollow seate, of the womans Statua, and the going out of the way, is easily solued; for as is manifest, out of the first booke of sacred Cerimonyes *Sect.* 2. there were three seates of stone in the *Lateran* Church, in which the new Pope did sit at the tyme of his Coronation. The first seate was before the entrance into the Temple, which was vile and abiect, to which seate, the new Pope was first brought, and did sit vpon it for a little space, that it might be signified by that cerimony, that he ascended from a most low place, to the highest place that is, for lifting him from thence, they sung that 1. *Reg.* 2. *Suscitat de puluere egenum, & de stercore erigit pauperem; vt sedeat cum Principibus, & solium gloriæ teneat*: and this is the cause, why that seate is called *Stercoraria*. Another seate was of Porphiry in the Pallace it selfe, and there he sate the second tyme, in token of Possession: and sitting there he receaued the Kayes of the Church of the *Lateran* Pallace. The third seat was like the second, and not farre from it, and after sitting a little in it, he deliuered the same keyes to him, of whome he had receaued them before. Perhaps, that by that cerimony he might be admonished of death, by which ere long he was to resigne that power to another. Of any seate to discouer the sexe, there is no mention any where.

XXI. And that Statua of the woman with child, without doubt was not of Pope *Iohn*: for if our Aduersaries say, that the ancient Historiographers would not make mention of this woman in their bookes, in the Popes fauour: how is it probable, that the Popes themselues would haue memory of it extant in a Statua? Besides, if it were the Statua of this *Iohn*, it should haue represented a Woman with an infant

» infant newly borne, but that Image did neither represent
» a woman, nor did carry an infant in her armes, but did
» expresse a good big boy, and many yeares old, as a seruant
» going before. Wherefore some do coniecture, that it was
» a Statua of some heathen Priest prepared to Sacrifice, before
» whom his Minister went.

XXII. » Finally it is not in detestation of that cryme, why
» the Popes go not the shorter way to the *Lateran*, but because
» the way is narrow and steepy, and therefore incommodi-
» ous for the Popes trayne, or compaine, which alwayes vseth
» to be very great. Adde, that as *Onuphrius* witnesseth, there
» want not Popes, who haue oftner then once gone that
» very way.

FINIS.

Omnia Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Romanæ
subiecta sunto.

A TA-

A TABLE OF THE PARTICVLER MATTERS CONTEYNED IN THIS BOOKE.

ADORATION of Images, & the Eucharist vſed before the yeare 606. c. 11. n. 11.

Arti, what it ſignifieth in compoſition cap. 1. nu. 3.

Antichriſt how taken in the Scriptures, & other Authors. c. 1. n. 4. His members ſomtime open enemies to Chriſt. cap. 2. n. 11. How he ſhalbe an Apoſtata, c. 2. n. 15. How he ſhall draw men to follow him, c. 2. n. 17. His comming and reuelation all one, cap. n. 18. He ſhalbe one particuler man cap. 2. per totum. He is ſignifyed by the former beaſt (Apoc. 13) cap. 5 n. 5. His falſe Prophet is ſignified by the latter, ibid. Whether he be the wounded head Apoc. 13. ibi. His perſecution moſt grieuous, cap 7. n. 1. Greater then the calamities of the Iewes, cap. 7 : n 2. It ſhalbe moſt manifeſt: c, 7 : n :: In Antichriſts time all the Churches enemies ſhall ioyne to impugne her, c. 7. n. 6. The publike and daily ſacrifice ſhall ceaſe. cap. 7. n. 7. The laſt moneth of Antichriſts life is not accoũted in his raigne, cap 8. n. 2. He ſhall reigne 3. yeares & a halfe, cap. 8. per totum. He ſhalbe Prince of all the wicked in generall, c. 8 n. 3. The tyme of his reigne very ſhort. cap. 8. n. 5. He may rayſe an vniuerſall perſecution at one time. cap. 8. n. 6. Two degrees of his deſtruction, c. 9. n. 2.

Antichriſts comming ſhall not be long before the end of the world, c. 9. per totum. He cannot be ſaid to come at all, but in the laſt houre cap. 9. n. 3. His name ſhalbe knowne when he is come, cap. 9. n. 1. & 2. It is yet vnknowne, c. 10. n. 4. He ſhalbe a moſt potent King c, 10. n. 7. His Marke or Character but one, cap. 11. n. 4. He ſhall be receaued of the Iewes for their Meſſias, cap 12. n. 4. & ſeq:

He ſhalbe Iew, cap 12. n. 10. His ſeat ſhalbe at Ieruſalem. c. 13. n. 1. & ſeq. Why thoſe that follow him are called Gentills, cap 13. 1. He ſhall ſit in materiall Churches, and not in the Church of Chriſt as a Biſhop cap. 13. n. 10. Whoſoeuer vſurpeth more dignity then is due to him, is his forerunner, ib. He is the head of all the proud, ib. He ſhall openly deny Ieſus to be Chriſt c. 14. n. 2. & ſeq. How he ſhall ſeduce, cap. 14. n 3. He ſhall exceed all heretikes, ibid. He ſhall deny Chriſt to be ſo much as the adopted ſonne of God, c. 14. n. 4. he ſhall prohibite the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, ib. he ſhalbe the Iewes Captaine, ibid. he ſhall reſtore all their cerimonies, ibid. he ſhall cauſe the Sabaoth to be obſerued, ibid. he will openly affirme himſelfe to be Chriſt, c. 14. n. 7. he will openly name himſelfe God, cap. 14. n. 9. Why & how he ſhall ſit in the Temple, ibid. He will permit no other Gods beſides himſelfe, cap. 14. 11. & 12. He ſhall commit the greateſt ſinnes when he cannot all cap 14. n. 12. How he may extoll himſelfe aboue God, ibid. he ſhall not worſhip or honour many Gods, c 14 n. 14. He ſhall adore the diuell ſecretly, c. 14. n. 14. his diſpoſition, ibid. He ſhall worke many ſignes, c 15. n. 1. he is not proued to be King of the Iewes becauſe Antiochus was ſo, c. 16. n. 9. he ſhall ariſe from baſe eſtate, cap. 16. n. 14. & ſequ. He ſhall ouercome 3 Kings, cap. 16. n 12. he ſhall ſubdue the 7 Kings which remayne after the three, and ſo he ſhalbe monarch of the whole world, cap. 16. n 14. he ſhall perſecute the Chriſtians through the whole world with an innumerable army, cap. 16. n. 15 & c. 17. per totum.

Antichriſtianiſme is not Atheiſme c. 4. n. 12.

Antiochus Epiphanes is not ſpoken of at all in the 7. & 11. chap of Daniel, cap 7 n. 7. he was an Idolater, c. 14. n. 12. he impugned not the Gods of Syria, c. 14. n. 16. he worſhipped many Gods, ibid. he was a type of Antichriſt only in ſome principall points, cap. 16. n. 3. Only he among the Kings of Syria, is in the Scripture accounted a perſecutour of the Iewes, c. 16. n. 7. how he aroſe from baſe eſtate, cap. 16. n. 14. & ſeq. he inuaded not Egypt oftner then twice, c. 16. n. 13.

Antiochus Magnus & Seleucus Philopater his elder ſonne were the Iewes benefactors, c. 16. n. 7.

Arias Montanus, cap. 6, n. 3.

S. Auguſtine anſwereth Downams obiection, c. 6 n 5. & 8. he maketh no more doubt that Elias ſhall come, then that S. Iohn Baptiſt is come, ibid. The Apoſtaſy is not the miſtery of iniquity, c. 2. n. 16. c. 14. n. 3.

B

BELLARMINES aduantage in this controuerſie, cap. 1. n. 1. He agreeth with former Catholikes, c. 1. n. 2. he is vniuſtly charged by Downam, cap. 7. n. 5. c. 8. n. 5. c. 10 n. 7. c. 14 n. 10. c 16. n. 11. he vrgeth Downams obiection further then he doth himſelfe

ſelfe, c. 11. n. 9. his ſincere dealing, cap. 12. n. 1. He reuerenceth the Fathers, c. 14. n 7.

C

CALVIN thinketh that only Chriſt is in heauen, and that others ſtay without, cap. 6. n. 6.

The *Canons* of the generall Coũcell, c 3. n. 4. Catholike doctrine ſtandeth not ſo much vpon denyalls, as the Proteſtants doth, c. 12. & 13.

The *Character* of Antichriſt ſhall be common to all in his Kingdome, c. 11. n. 4. It ſhalbe carryed not only by Chriſtians, but alſo by Iewes, ibid. It may be carryed in the right hand, or in the forhead, ib. It is not profeſſion or practiſe, ibid. It ſhalbe viſible, c. 11. n. 12.

Chriſts firſt comming was not terrible as his ſecond ſhallbe. c. 6. n. 3. His power and knowledge are not to be limited by that which he did, cap. 2. n. 17 He and Antichriſt cãnot haue both one marke, c. 11. n. 7.

The *Church* of Chriſt cãnot haue the marke of Antichriſt, c. 11 n. 5.

The *Church* was alwayes ſubiect to the Pope, ibid.

The *Church* cõprehendeth not all, that profeſſe the name of Chriſt, cap. 13. n. 4. There is one viſible Catholike *Church*, cap. 13. n. 5. It is to endure to the end of the world, cap. 13. n. 7.

Chriſme vſed in the Church before the yeare 607, c 11. n 6. how it maketh vs Chriſtians, ib. how it is more to be reuerenced then Baptiſme, ibid.

The *Conuerting* of one argueth more power, then the peruerting of many, cap 6. n. 6

The *Councell* of Chalcedon, cap. 3. n. 4.

D

THE Tribe of *Dan* fell not firſt to Idolatry, c. 12. n. 2.

Why it is omitted Apoc 7. ib.

Dayes are not taken for yeares, cap. 8. n. 7.

The *Diuell* is ſignified by the beaſt (Apoc 17.) c. 15. n 5 & 6.

M. Downam ſeemeth not to haue read ſo much of Bellarmine as he impugneth, cap. 3. n. 4. he omiteth Bellarmines proofes, and anſwereth his owne, cap 4 n. 4. 5. 6. 7. he changeth Bellarmines argument, c. 5. n 2 & 3. c 8 n. 7. c 13. n. 9. he taketh the obiection, and omitteth the anſwere, c. 6 n. 4. c. 13 n 9. & 10. He cannot defend his fellowes, c. 2. n. 14. c. 6 n. 6. c 8. n. 7. c. 14. n. 12. & 19. c. 16. n. 14. he impugneth his fellowes, cap. 8 n. 7. c. 10. n. 7. He impugneth himſelfe, cap. 12. n. 2. & 9. c. 15. n. 5. & 6. he contradicteth himſelfe, cap. 5. n. 5. c. 10. n. 3. 4. & 6. c 11. n. 4. & 12. c. 13. n. 1. c. 16. n. 5 7. 12. he ſpeaketh from the purpoſe, c. 2. n 12. & 15. c 14. n. 6. 8. & 10. c. 16. n. 4. & 8. his petitio principij, c. 2. n. 17. & 20. c. 5. n. 3. c. 6. n. 4. c 7. n. 3. & 7. c. 10 n. 4. 5. & 7. c. 11. n. 4. & 7. c. 13. n. 6. 9. & 10. he diſſembleth the difficulty, c. 2. n. 20. c. 4. n. 7. c. 7. n. 4. c. 16. n. 11. his poore ſhifts, c. 3. n. 1. & 5. c. 6. n 4. his iuggling, c. 10. n. 2. c. 12. n. 2. c. 13 n. 1. & 2. he tranſlateth not well, c 3. n. 1 c. 5. n. 4. c. 15. n. 3. he expoundeth the Scripture childiſhly, c. 4. n. 8, He mangleth the

the ſcripture, c.5:n. 5. c. 6.n.5. he admitteth what tranſlation & interpretation he liſteth,c.6.n. 3. he condemneth Eccleſiaſticus,& the Iewes of his time, c: 6.n. 4. he condemneth the Apoſtles, and in ſome ſort our Sauiour himſelfe c. 6. n. 5. he ioyneth with Porphiry an Apoſtata againſt all eccleſiaſticall writers, and Iewes alſo. c.5,n.v.c.7.n.7. c.16.n.5. Our Sauiours words in his opinion are not true, c.14.n.7. his boldnes with the Scripture, c. 14. n. 16. he ioyneth with the Iewes in impugning the Pope, c. 16. n. 3. his expoſition contrary to all others, euen his owne fellowes, c,16. n. 7. he belyeth the Primitiue Church againſt the teſtimonies of the Fathers, c: 13 n.9. he ſcoffeth at S. Gregory, cap. 6 n. 7.c:8.n.6. he corrupteth S. Ireræus his words and meaning, c: 10.n.7. he impugneth the fathers authority, c. 12. n. 2. he acknowledgeth the Fathers to be againſt him,c.14.n.19. he abuſeth S. Hierome, c. 16,n.9: he maketh much account of one Father, if he fauoureth his fancy, c. 4. n. 12. he forgetteth what he impugneth, c 5. n. 2. c.7.n.6. he confirmeth one abſurdity with another far greater, c 5. n. 2. he cutteth of thoſe wordes which make moſt to the purpoſe, c: 6.n. 3 he proueth an vniuerſall by a particuler, c: 10, n, 3. he ſũneth to generalities, when he cannot anſwere the particuler argument, c. 8. n.4. his ſtrange paradoxe, cap. 14. n. 9. he belyeth the Pope and Church of Rome, c.14. n. 17 he weakneth his fellowes arguments, c. 2 n.9. his abſurd folly, c.2,n.10. He cenſureth the Fathers, c: 2. n: 13. His vayne bragging, c:2:n.19: c.6.n. 8. he addeth an head of his owne to the 7. of the beaſt (Apoc. 17.) c. 2.n:21. he is nothing ſcrupulous in his account, c. 3. n.3. his fond imagination, c. 4. n.10, his immodeſty, c.4. n.14. he is not moderate in his cenſure, c, 5. n.3. his impudency, c5. n. 3. c. 6. n.3. c. 14. n. 4. He ſeemeth to thinke, that the Diuel can do true myracles, c.5:n.5.c.15. n. 3. he attributeth more to merits then euer any Catholik did, c.6 n.3. In his opinion Enochs tranſlation maketh as much for any other vertue, as for pennance, contrary to the Scripture, c. 6 n: 4. & 8. his Martyrs, heretikes and rebells, c. 7. n.3. he maintaineth open rebellion and treaſon, c. 7. n. 4. his ſhamleſſe lye. c. 7. n.3. his & Porphiryes pertinacy, c. 7. n. 7. his conferrence of Scripture, ibid. his and Foxes expoſition of Scripture. c. 8. n. 3. his, and his fellowes manner of diſputing, c.7. n. 7. his childiſh cauill, c:8 n:1. he maketh the ancient Church to be very corrupt, c:n:n:5. his blaſphemy, ibid. He ſeemeth to haue bene a Puritan when he wrote of Antichriſt, c.13.nu. 3. & 10. his trifling, c.14.n. 4. he belyeth Gregory the 7. cap. 16. n.12. He belyeth the Cardinalls, ibid. Why he admitteth any of the Fathers, c.16. n.14.

E

THE Booke of *Eccleſiaſticus* Canonicall Scripture, cap 6.n 4.

Elias and *Enoch* ſhall preach in a manner, as long as Antichriſt ſhall raigne, cap: 6. n. 7.

Elias ſhall come in perſon, cap. 2. n 13.

n: 13: & cap: 6: per totum.

How *Elias* ſhall reſtore all things ibid.

The neceſſity of the comming of *Enoch* and *Elias*, cap, 6: n: 5:

Enoch & *Elias* are not in heauen, cap, 6. n: 6

Enoch and *Elias* ſhall begin to preach in the beginning of Antichriſts raigne, cap. 8: n: 4.

The *End* of the world is not only the laſt inſtant. c, 9: n: 4. Whether they which liue at Antichriſts death may gather how long it is to the end of the world, c. 8. n. 4. Only the iuſt and learned ſhall make this collection, ibid.

The Trybe of *Ephraim* not omitted Apoc. 7. cap. 12. n: 2.

When the proper *Expoſition* is to be preferred, cap. 4: n: 12.

How far diuers *Expoſitions* are to be admitted, cap. 2. n: 16.

F

RHE neceſſity of the *Fathers* expoſitions, c. 10. n. 3. Their authority, ibid: how Catholikes eſteeme of them, cap. 12. n. 1.

The *Feeliſh* dreame of the foole *Fox*, c. 8. n. 3.

G

HOVV the *Goſpell* was in the whole world in the Apoſtles tyme, cap 4 n 14.

The *Goſpell* ſhalbe preached to all Nations before Antichriſts comming, cap. 4. per totum.

Greeke article, when it ſignifieth a particuler thing. c. 2 n. 4

S. Gregory anſwereth Downams obiection, cap, 6. n 8.

Gregory the 14. c. 16. n. 12.

Gog & *Magog*, c. 17. per totum.

H

A Great *Happineſſe* to be put to death by Antichriſt, cap. 6 n: 8.

The *Herodians*, c. 12. n: 10.

Why *Heretikes* can worke no myracles, cap. 15. n. 2.

The 7. *Heads* of the beaſt Apoc. 13. are not the ſame with Apoc. 17. cap. 15. n. 4.

The little *Horne* Dan. 7. is not the ſame with that of Dan. 8. c. 16. n. 1.

S. *Hippolytus*, cap. 11. n. 12.

I

IANSENIVS, cap. 6. n. 4.

S. Ierome confuteth Porphiry & Downam, c: 7. n: 7.

The *Importance* of the controuerſie, c: 1: n. 1.

The *Interruption* of the Iewes ſacrifice was only 3. yeares, c. 7. n. 7.

Ioſephus corrupted, c. 8. n: 2:

Iupiter, cap: 14: n: 12:

K

THE *Kingdomes* wherof Daniel ſpeaketh, were not to be ended before Chriſt, cap. 16. nu. 5. Whē our Sauiour is to deſtroy thē, ibid. When he began ſpiritually to ouerthrow them, ibid.

The 4. *Kingdomes* into which that of Alexander was deuided, belong to the 3 beaſt deſcribed Dan. 7. and not to the 4. c. 16. n 6. & 18.

The *Kingdomes* of the Lagidæ, and Seleucidæ cānot be ſignified by the 4 beaſt, Dan. 7. c. 16. n. 6.

Why the 3. *Kings*, which Antichriſt ſhall ſlay, are called the 3. firſt

or former, c. 6. n. 12.

L

THE *Latin* Interpreter is not to be reiected, cap. 6. n. 4.

The name of *Latin* cannot be giuen to the Pope, c. 10. n. 6. It contayneth not the number 666. ib. n. 7.

How *Latria* is giuen to the Crosse by Catholikes, c. 11. n. 12.

Why the Tribe of *Leui* is often omitted, c. 11. n. 2.

M

MARTINVS 5. his Bul against the Hussites, cap 11. n. 4.

A *Mortall* man may be truly called God, cap 14. n. 11.

Maozim signifieth not the true God, c. 14. n 14. It may signify Antichrist, ibid. It signifieth a strong tower, cap 14. n. 15

Myracles in generall belong both to good & bad, c. 15. n 2. Why the diuells help is necessary to worke counterfait *Myracles*, c. 5. n. 5. & c. 15. n. 3.

N

THE *Name* which contayneth the nũber 666. shalbe the proper & vsual name of Antichrist c. 10. n. 7.

Many *Names* contayne that number, ibid.

Nilus cap. 15 n. 2.

O

THE *Oath* of Obedience made to the B. of Rome before the yeare 606. cap. 11. n. 8.

If the *Oath* be lawful, the often exacting of it is not culpable, ibid.

One faith, & one Church, c. 13. n 3.

P

PROTESTANTS put Catholikes to death for Religiõn, c 7. n. 4.

An inuisible *Persecution* of an inuisible congregation, cap. 7 n. 6.

Phocas gaue not the title of vniuersall to the Pope, c 7. n. 4. And that which he gaue, the Pope had before, ibid.

The *Pope* hath power to depose Princes for the spirituall good of Christs Church, cap. 3 n. 5.

The *Popes* whom the Protestants account Antichrist, arise not from base estate, cap. 16. n. 11.

The *Pope* no temporal Monarch, cap. 16. n. 14.

The *Protestants* expositiõ of Scripture not much worth, cap. 2, n. 16. How much they agree with the Samosatens, and all other heretikes, c. 3. n 2. Their disagreement about Antichrists cõming, c 3 n. 3.

The *Prophesies* concerning the destruction of Ierusalem, and the end of the world intermingled, c 4. n. 9.

The *Persecution* of Catholikes in England, c. 7 n. 4.

R

THE reason of *Romes* prehemi-nence, is not because it is the chiefe Citty, c. 3. n. 4.

X. Kings shall diuide the *Roman* Empyre among them, so that there shalbe no *Roman* Emperour in their time, cap 5. n. 2.

The *Roman* Empyre signified by the 2. irõ Legs of Nabuchodonosors Statua, and the 4. beast (Dan 7.) cap. 5. n. 2. By the 10. toes of Nabuchodonosors Statua, and the 10. hornes of the 4. beast Dan. 7. are signified

ſignified the 10. Kings, which ſhall deuide the *Roman* Empyre among them, cap. 5. n. 2.

The *Roman* Empyre ſhalbe vtterly deſtroyed by the 10. Kings, c. 5. n. 3. & per totum. How many wayes the Fathers affirme the vtter deſtruction of the *Roman* Empire, & why they ſpeake ſparingly of this point, c. 5. n. 3.

There is now a *Roman* Emp. indeed, and not in name or title only, cap. 5. n. 3.

The name *Romanus* contayneth not the number 666 c. 10. n. 7.

To cleaue to the *Roman* Church was the ſigne of a true Catholike before the yeare 606. c. 11. n. 7.

How the Church of *Rome* is vnited & ſtãdeth with other Churches, ibid. Thoſe which belong not to the Church of *Rome*, belong not to Chriſt, but to Antichriſt, ibid.

Not Chriſtian, but Heathen *Rome* is called *Babylon* and an Harlot (Apoc. 17. &c.) cap. 13. n. 8.

S

SACRIFICE for the dead vſed before the yeare 606. c 11. n. 10.

The difficulty of *Scripture*, and why many erre in the interpretation therof, cap 7. n. 7.

When the *Scripture* is litterally to be vnderſtood of the figure, and when of the thing figured, c. 14. n. 13.

How we may argue from the myſticall *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, c. 10. n. 3.

The myſticall *Senſe* intended by the holy Ghoſt, ibid.

Except the litterall *Senſe* be certaine, we cãnot argue from it, ibid.

The conſent of the Fathers, maketh both *Senſes* certayne, ibid.

Why *Seleucus Philopater* is called *Viliſſimus*, c. 16. n. 8.

The *Seauenty* two Interpreters not to be reiected, c. 6. n. 7.

The *Sybils* verſes of Adrian are expounded, c. 10. n. 2.

Why *Symeon* is omitted in *Moyſes* his bleſſing, cap. 12 n. 2.

How the *Signes* of Antichriſt ſhalbe lying, c. 15 n. 1.

T

TEMPLE what it ſignifieth in the new Teſtament, c. 13. n. 3.

How the *Temple* of Ieruſalem is by S. Paul called the Temple of God c. 13. n 9. And it ſhalbe built again in the end of the world, ibid. But it ſhalbe alway prophane ibid. It ſhall not be finiſhed, ibid. The thouſand yeares, Apoc. 2. are to be taken indefinitely, cap. 7. n. 2.

By the great *Tribulation*, Matth. 24. is meant the perſecution of Antichriſt a little before the end of the world, cap. 4. n. 5. & 13.

The *Turks* inferior to Antichriſt, c. 14. n. 7.

V

VNCTION of Prieſts vſed before the yeare 606. cap. 11. n. 9.

The word (*vntill*) ſignifieth neither continuance nor ceſſation, but is indifferent to both, cap. 13. n. 9. *Vrbanus* 7. cap. 16. n. 12.

FINIS.

Faultes eſcaped in the Printing.

Page,	*Line,*	*Fault,*	*Correction.*
28.	29.	is forerunner	is forerunne
41.	39.	in the Apoſtaſy	in the Apoſtles time
113.	33.	beginning: neither	beginning neither:
ibid.	8.	hatred of	hatred out of
172.	15.	deemeth	denyeth
180.	34.	graunteth	groundeth
192.	12.	19. and laſt chapter	19. laſt chapters
229.	34.	former grounds	ſounder grounds
237.	38.	them, ſo	them ſo,
266.	39.	Antichriſt ſitting	Antichriſt his ſitting
272.	20.	all Idols.	alſo Idols.
275.	2.	frame himſelfe	feigne himſelfe
276.	7.	ſhewing as	ſhewing himſelfe as
281.	7.	prouided	proued
298.	5.	proue, that	proue, but that
310.	18.	tortures	torturers
315.	29.	Antichriſts	Antichriſt
320.	36.	one and	one. And
335.	23.	as neither the 2.	as neither the 3.
339.	34.	expoſition, wherof	expoſition wherof
380.	1.	Maozim. Neither	Maozim, who ſeeth not that Chriſt is the God Maozim? Neither &c.
387.	13.	bould of	bloud of
413.	24.	aboue thoſe	about thoſe

Other faultes of leſſe moment by reaſon of the obſcure copy, and abſence of the Author, haue likewiſe eſcaped, which the Reader may eaſily find, and correct of himſelfe.